DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 550 95 CE 000 730

TITLE Career Education: Implications for Minorities. Proceedings of a National Conference (February 1-3, 1973, Washington, D.C.).
INSTITUTION Nellum (A.L.) and Associates, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.; National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 73
CONTRACT OEC-0-73-0708
NOTE 111p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Conference Reports; Conferences; Educational Finance; *Minority Groups; Speeches

ABSTRACT

The conference, whose proceedings are recorded in the document, met to fulfill a need observed at the 1972 National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks. It was apparent the following gaps in communication needed to be closed: providing minority leaders with information on the concept of career education as viewed by the Office of Education; providing the OE with a minority viewpoint on career education; and developing a dialogue between minority leaders, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, and OE on matters relating to education. To meet these objectives, the conference was called, and representatives from seven minority groups met with non-minority conferees. In open session, the implications of career education for minority groups and funding were discussed. Other related topics were discussed by panels and in small group sessions. Reports of statements by minority caucuses, which resulted in formal resolutions and position papers, are included. Twenty-three recommendations are offered to guide the development of the career education concept. In addition to verbatim transcription of the proceedings, the conference agenda and list of participants are included. (AG)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085550

CAREER EDUCATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR MINORITIES

PROCEEDINGS OF A NATIONAL CONFERENCE
February 1-3, 1973
Washington, D.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 000 730

CAREER EDUCATION:
IMPLICATIONS FOR MINORITIES

PROCEEDINGS OF A NATIONAL CONFERENCE
February 1-3, 1973
Washington, D.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Dr. John R. Ottina, Acting Commissioner
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

June 1973

Conference management and preparation of the proceedings were handled by:

A. L. Nellum and Associates, Inc.
1025 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

under U.S. Office of Education Contract No. OEC-0-73-0708

The work presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a Contract from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

PREFACE

The Conference on Career Education: Implications for Minorities, held at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D.C., on February 1,2 and 3, 1973, was funded by the U.S. Office of Education . which cosponsored the gathering with the following organizations:

Council of Chief State School Officers
National Advisory Council on Vocational Education
State Higher Education Executive Officers

The steering committee for the conference was composed of the following:

Officers

REGINALD PETTY, *Chairman*
National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

ROBERT ACOSTA, *Vice Chairman*
California State Department of Education

RONALD PATTERSON, *Vice Chairman*
Erie County Community Action Organization

YVONNE PRICE, *Secretary*
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights

WILLIAM C. YOUNG, *Project Officer*
U.S. Office of Education

Members

SISTER ADELE ARROYO
Cabinet Committee on Opportunities
for Spanish Speaking People

ULYSSES BYAS
National Alliance of Black Superintendents

LAWRENCE DAVENPORT
National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

WALTER DAVIS
AFL-CIO

CANDIDO DeLEON
Hostos Community College

HONORABLE AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
U.S. House of Representatives

DOREEN FENG
Office of Economic Opportunity

ERMON HOGAN
National Urban League

T. EDWARD HOLLANDER
New York State Department of Education

MARCELINE KEVIS
Coeur d'Alene Tribal Council

ELIZABETH DUNCAN KOONTZ
U.S. Department of Labor

PETER MUIRHEAD
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

JOHN C. PITTENGER
Pennsylvania Department of Education

WILLIAM ROARKE
Brick Institute of America

A. I. THOMAS
Prairie View A&M College

DAVID USHIO
Japanese-American Citizens League

RICARDO ZAZUETA
Operation SER

A.L. Nellum and Associates (ALNA) coordinated and managed the National Conference on Career Education: Implications for Minorities, and was responsible for the recording of conference sessions and the editing and publication of the proceedings. Project director was A. Carol Payne, director of conference management for ALNA. She was assisted in coordination and management activities by the following persons:

Nancy Firmin—Secretary
Dorothy Connelly—Finance
Patricia Leigh and Ruby Edwards—Registration

Two members of ALNA's staff, Dolores Leme and Maria Maldonado, contributed spare time to helping with Spanish language registrations. Other volunteer assistance was provided by:

Patricia Dickerson—Office of Education
Gail Tarleton and Janice Randall—National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

Editing and production of the proceedings was handled by Virginia Douglas, director of ALNA's documents department; Janet Shoenfeld, associate writer/editor; and A. Carol Payne.

ALNA's Final Report, Part I, Technical Operations (submitted to OE on March 9, 1973), briefly describes the planning and implementation of the conference, together with some conclusions and recommendations for future gatherings. Included also with Part I were copies of the invitational packet sent to attendees, invited position papers submitted prior to the conference, form correspondence, registration blanks, and the conference packet. This proceedings constitutes Part II of ALNA's Final Report.

CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iii

I. CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT 1

II. INTRODUCTION 3

III. PROCEEDINGS OF GENERAL SESSIONS AND DISCUSSION GROUPS 5

Thursday Opening Sessions 5

Panel: Implications of Career Education for Various Minority Groups. 10

Thursday Luncheon Address:

The Honorable Shirley Chisholm 12

Thursday Afternoon Session: 14

Dr. Thomas Glennan 14

Dr. John Ottina 17

Thursday Small Groups Sessions: Educational Models and Programs 20

Thursday Afternoon General Session, Panel: Funding Career Education (State and Federal): Where Do the Funds Come From? 20

Friday Morning Panel: Positions and Issues on Career Education 30

Friday Luncheon Addresses: 42

The Honorable Augustus Hawkins 42

The Honorable William A. Steiger 44

Friday Afternoon Session: Report of Reaction Groups 46

Friday Evening: Dinner Program 51
    Ms. Anna Chennault 51
    Mr. Arthur Fletcher 53
    Ms. Elizabeth Duncan Koontz 53
IV. **MINORITY CAUCUSES** 59
Statements of Minority Caucuses 59
    Chinese American Caucus 59
    Japanese American Caucus 59
    Chicano Caucus 60
    Black Caucus 62
    Native American Caucus 63
    Puerto Rican Caucus 64
    Youth Caucus 64
Formal Resolutions/Position Papers from Minority Caucuses 65
    Chinese American Caucus 65
    Japanese American Caucus 66
    Chicano Caucus 68
    Black Caucus 70
    Native American Caucus 71
V. **CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS AAND RESOLUTIONS** 73
Resolutions (Compendium) 73
Recommendations (Compendium) 75

APPENDICES

A. AGENDA

B. CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

I. CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT

by
Reginald Petty
Chairman, Conference Steering Committee
and
Director of Research, National Advisory Committee on Vocational Education

The idea for a National Conference on Career Education: Implications for Minorities was prompted by the 1972 National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks, co-sponsored by the Urban League and the Congressional Black Caucus. During the Conference, several of my colleagues in vocational education and I became aware of an apparent lack of information among the conferees regarding career education, even though the concept was being hailed as a new direction for public school education and millions in government funds were being used to test its validity. When apprised of this fact, the 1972 conferees voted out a recommendation that a follow-up meeting on the subject be conducted.

Congressman Augustus F. Hawkins of California, chairman of the 1972 Conference and chairman of the House Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities, requested that Lawrence Davenport, then chairman of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, and myself undertake the task of securing sponsorship of a Career Education Conference that would include all racial minorities.

Contact was made with leaders within the various minority groups to determine if such an idea was workable. The response was overwhelmingly positive. When the proposed conference and the support and response it had generated were presented to the U.S. Office of Education, it received not only official sanction, but funds and staff to ensure its implementation. Subsequently, the Council of Chief State School Officers and the State Higher Education Executive Officers joined the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (NACVE) and the Office of Education as co-sponsors of the conference.

The sponsors readily agreed that all facets of planning and conducting the conference would remain in the control of the participating minority groups.

National leaders and educators of the Black, Chicano, Native American, Puerto Rican, Chinese American, and Japanese American communities were contacted to recommend persons to serve on the conference steering committee. The names of these dedicated and hard-working persons appear elsewhere in this report. However, it should be noted here that much of the conference's success and accomplishments resulted from the committee's efforts.

The conference was proposed as an activity wherein officials of the sponsoring organizations and representatives of the various minority groups in the country would unite to develop a dialogue on the development and implementation of career education. The goals of the conference could be described as the following:

- To provide minority leaders with information on the concept of career education as viewed by the Office of Education
- To provide the Office of Education with a minority viewpoint on career education
- To develop a dialogue between minority leaders, NACVE, and the Office of Education on matters relating to education

With these objectives in mind, the steering committee developed a formula for conference participation based on the minority group's relative size in the U.S. population. A general guideline was that each invitee should be representative of some constituency within his/her racial or ethnic group. Additionally, the four sponsoring agencies were alloted ten invitational slots. The tremendous public response generated by the conference caused some deviation from these guidelines, but by and large, the rule prevailed.

The culmination of any successful event results in a long list of thank you's. Having already noted the fine work of the steering committee as a whole, I would like to especially thank Kelly Acosta, chairman of the invitational committee; and William C. Young, project officer from the Office of Education, who also served as a participating member of the steering committee.

Additionally, on behalf of the steering committee, our thanks go to the four sponsoring agencies; to A.L. Nellum and Associates, which coordinated and managed the conference; to the program participants; and, above all, to the conferees, whose participation and response made the work worthwhile.

II. INTRODUCTION

by
A. Carol Payne, A.L. Nellum and Associates, Inc.
Project Director for the Conference on Career Education:
Implications for Minorities

In the early stages of this country's development as a highly technological society, education was viewed by various ethnic and national minorities as the surest road into the American economic and social mainstream. For the most part this has continued to be true of America's racial minorities. In the course of their struggles to achieve parity with the majority population, they too, have generally maintained the belief that a good education is the keystone to building a successful life.

Lately, however, the American education system has been under attack from these same groups who see themselves as being ill-served by a system that once offered hope. It is little wonder, when the Office of Education announced a major new thrust for American schools, career education, that minority educators and laymen sounded a note of concern as to its development and subsequent impact on their communities.

The National Urban League in its first newsletter from the League's Education Policy Information Center called career education a "potential threat to the educational options open to America's Black and urban poor." Additionally, educators in attendance at the Policy Conference on Education for Blacks, convened in the spring of 1972 became alarmed over the apparent lack of minority involvement in the development of the career education concept, in light of the Office of Education's funding of promotion and demonstration projects.

Spurred by these and other concerns and by the apparent misunderstanding of the new direction the Office of Education was undertaking, a group of minority persons asked OE to become the prime sponsor for the National Conference on Career Education: Implications for Minorities. It agreed to do so.

Conceived as a national meeting to inform the minority communities about the goals of the new concept and to serve as a forum for discussion between the minority communities and the agencies involved in its development, the conference was enthusiastically received by both the education community and the minority groups.

When the conference convened in Washington, D.C., on February 1, 1973, it was perhaps one of the most culturally and racially diverse groupings ever assembled to address a major national issue. Participating in the two-and-one-half day conference were more than 300 persons who were members of six racial and national minority groups: Chicano, Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, Chinese Americans, Black Americans, and Japanese Americans.

Conference registration records reflect the following participation breakdown:

Puerto Rican	7
Chicano	29
Japanese Americans	12
Chinese Americans	20
Black Americans	161
Native Americans	20
White Americans	83
Phillipine Americans	1

The participants were selected by a 21-member steering committee (16 of whom were minority persons), for not only their minority status, but also for their involvement in activities of vital importance to career education. The following categorical criteria governed the participant recommendation and selection process:

- Minority leaders and opinion makers
- Minority higher education administrators
- Minority leaders in elementary, secondary, adult, vocational, and technical education
- Minority leaders representing labor, business, boards of education, civil rights groups, community leaders, parents, and students.
- State superintendents of education or representatives.

The framework for the conference program was designed by the steering committee after much consultation with the various groups involved. The program allowed for a maximum of exchange among and between officials from the Office of Education and conference participants. This exchange consisted primarily of formal presentations, panel discussions, small-group discussions, minority caucuses, and question-and-answer sessions. Perhaps as important a vehicle for exchange as any specific program item was the high degree of social and interpersonal contact that took place during coffee breaks, lunches, and similar occasions. Many of the participants had inserted into the official conference proceedings their appreciation for the unique opportunity the conference afforded them to hear and learn of the commonalities of concern and purposes they shared with other minority group members. As can be noted in the resolutions and recommendations, each group proposed a minority advisory committee to assist the Office of Education in planning.

This report of the proceedings of the conference is an attempt to give as factual and accurate account as possible of what transpired during those two-and-one-half days. All meetings of the general sessions and presentations at luncheon and dinner functions were transcribed by a professional conference reporter. In the case of the small group discussions and caucus meetings, reports and statements were reported back to total conference. To ensure that the material generated by the meeting, especially statements and positions made by the individual minority caucuses, not get lost in the general editing and assembling of the final record, the conferees voted in favor of the report containing as much of the verbatim transcription as possible and specified that caucus statements would be presented in their original form.

The editors thus approached the voluminous transcribed proceedings precariously balanced between the mandate of the conferees and the challenge of translating the sometimes garbled spoken word into a coherent, cohesive written statement. With the exception of the aforementioned caucus statements and resolutions, speeches have been edited and some presentations excerpted or summarized for space considerations, and to increase clarity and communication. Therefore, it is hoped that any participant reviewing these proceedings who finds his best remarks lost or improperly summarized or excerpted will be forgiving.

In summary, it should be noted for benefit of readers who did not attend the conference that it was considered a success in terms of both the human responses it elicited and the substance of the work it performed. However, to assume that this was accomplished without the normal tensions and controversies normally associated with meetings of this type would be erroneous. As a "special interest" conference, it carried its own special brand of creative tensions. It is to the credit of all who participated in one form or another that these energies were constructively harnessed and employed for the benefit of the entire group.

Hopefully, this document will serve as an information tool to the Office of Education and to state and local officials charged with developing and implementing the concept of career education. This, in the final analysis, will be the ultimate determinant of the conference's success.

III. PROCEEDINGS OF GENERAL SESSIONS AND DISCUSSION GROUPS

The conference opened Thursday, February 1, 1973, with registration at 8 a.m. at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C., the site of the meeting, and continued through Saturday, February 3, concluding with meetings in the early afternoon.

In addition to the general sessions, to which all were invited, each day the attendees broke off into small groups for the purposes of discussion, reaction to program events, and formulating statements and resolutions.

Presented in this section were the proceedings of the general sessions, the various addresses to the group (either full text or summaries), and proceedings of certain of the groups. The material is generally in chronological order following the agenda (see Attachment A), with a few exceptions as noted.

Thursday Opening Sessions

The conference was opened by Reginald Petty, conference chairman. The attendees were welcomed to the conference by Dr. Hugh Scott, Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia. The sponsors of the conference were introduced by Ms. Barbara Hatton, Stanford University; Dr. Calvin Dellefield, executive director, National Advisory Council on Vocational Education; Dr. T. Edward Hollander, Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education, New York State Education Department; Peter P. Muirhead, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and John C. Pittinger, Secretary of Education, Pennsylvania State Department of Education.

William C. Young, Special Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, Office of Education, was project officer for the conference.

Mr. William C. Young

In a brief introductory speech, Mr. Young described some of the work that had gone into the development of the conference and cited a number of questions that had been raised concerning the concept of career education. These questions included:

1. Is career education another form of tracking?
2. Is the concept of career education logical or practical?
3. Are present career education models widely adoptable or adaptable?
4. Are liberal arts colleges, especially Ivy League schools, ready for career education?
5. Is the rural residential model a first step to detention camps for undesirables in this country?
6. Does career education have underlying psychological, philosophical, historical, or sociological foundations?
7. Is career education another name for "discredited vocational education?"
8. Is career education an attempt to divert intelligent minority groups scholars away from academic fields?
9. Will career education help minorities crack the discriminatory hiring practices of certain employers and open hiring halls of all unions?
10. How will the liberal arts fare under a regimen of career education?
11. How does career education relate to our increasing amount of leisure time?

Mr. Young expressed the hope that the reactions and recommendations of the conference participants to the issues raised during the meeting would be seriously considered by policy makers at the

Office of Education and the National Institute of Education in the course of planning future efforts in the area of career education.

Dr. Sydney P.Marland

Following Mr. Young's remarks, Ulysses Byas, president of the National Alliance of Black Superintendents of Schools, introduced the principal speaker of the morning, Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The edited version of Dr. Marland's speech follows.

The real inspiration for this conference came months ago as a group of us were meeting in my office. Larry Davenport, who was then serving as chairman of the National Advisory Council of Vocational Technical Education, became the starter, the pusher, the shaker, in the months of planning that followed. I want to give credit to Larry for that original idea that is culminating here today.

But I do offer one word of caution to all here, not only to those who are representing organizations from all over the country, but to our own staff in the division of education: the danger in a meeting that focuses sharply on minority segments of our society, is that the intent can easily be mistranslated to imply that career education somehow is designed only for minority people. The quick reader or the uninformed or insensitive person might infer the exact opposite of what this meeting is all about. So, to everyone and particularly to the press and others who will be reporting upon this meeting: anything that implies a divisiveness in the theme of career education or suggests that it is a program serving only minorities is wrong.

Let me also convey, from the division of education, congratulations to all those have made this meeting possible. We congratulate them on the foresight and the cooperative spirit that have brought this conference together and thank all of you who have come from many walks of life and from many parts of the land to share your wisdom with us. Education reforms centering on the career education scene are impossible without such meetings as this. I am convinced that career education is a generally sound idea, but now we must impress upon its broad and relatively featureless countenance the substance and character that will make it a workable scheme in terms of the millions of Americans for whom education as presently constituted simply is not working.

Many members of the minority races are obviously finding themselves mired in this category of neglect, but frequently members of the white race as well at all economic levels find themselves ill-served in the present system. And it is toward reform of that system that career education addresses itself.

I would offer at this point a second acknowledgement—my recognition that you have come to this conference in a constructive, hopeful mood, but that you nevertheless entertain some very basic suspicions about the whole career education idea and wonder just what it will mean in practice for minority people. I note particularly the kinds of questions that Bill Young put before us are those questions that occur to many, as they do to me.

I don't blame you in the least for this attitude of concern, of guardedness expressed by some. You are not alone. While career education has in general been warmly received throughout the country, some look distrustfully upon it. I can particularly understand the well-founded doubt of the minority communities of America as to whether any Anglo—myself included—can understand the thinking of Blacks, Spanish people, Orientals, or Indians and your feelings toward a majority that has been historically ruthless in supressing your aspirations and your hopes, making glowing, but hollow promises for too long. You approach career education, therefore, as a new idea warily, fearing that it might turn out to be, as the National Urban League suspects, simply a fancy way to train poor people for a cheap labor market or attract selective learners away from college entrance.

It is my hope and expectation that this conference will allay and perhaps erase those fears. Yet, how could you be other than suspicious? You know all too well that, as our late President Johnson said, "To be Black in a White Society is not to stand on equal and level ground," nor I would add, "To be Brown or Red or to speak a language other than English."

You recognize with pain and outrage that, despite the undoubted achievements of the civil rights movement in the last 10 to 15 years, the ground on which we stand is still grossly unequal. Unemployment among minorities 16 years old and older is 9.9 percent nationally, nearly twice the white unemployment rate for the same age group at 5.4 percent. Joblessness for minority teenagers is 26 percent, while for the white race, it is half that. You know that a minority worker will find himself out of work far more often than a white worker; that he is far more likely to be a part-timer than his white counterpart; that jobs themselves, particularly among minority males, are much more likely to be lower paid, less interesting, and less desirable in other aspects.

These facts represent a clear legal injustice. To a large extent, they are a matter for the courts to decide, and decisions that help to rectify the situation are now being made every day. But inequality in occupational status and earnings is also clearly an educational matter. There is a very good chance that the minority person is inadequately prepared educationally to strive for, to get, and to hold an increasingly responsible place in our free market system. That is what career education is all about. It is not just for poor minorities, but for everybody.

Economic and occupational inequality in American is far from solely a matter of racial discrimination. Christopher Jencks, who has written a book on the subject of inequality, has this to say:

> "It seems quite shocking that white workers earn 50 percent more than black workers, but we are even more disturbed by the fact that the best paid fifth of all white workers earn 600 percent more than the worst paid fifth of all white workers. From this viewpoint, racial inequality looks almost insignificant."

What this says to me is that occupational inequality is spread across the population and that career education is needed for every American, whatever his or her calling, language, age, or location. It is needed for adults who came of age in another time when there was no hope of rectifying their occupational unpreparedness. They now can have a renewed hope and belief in themselves. It is needed in particular for the two-and-one-half million young people who spill out of our high schools and colleges every year, unskilled and unschooled, of all races, prepared only to disappear into our broadening, deepening pool of the unemployed, and underemployed, and the disillusioned. In a society such as ours, which prizes and rewards skills and competence above all else, there is simply no need and no room for the unskilled, the incompetent, and the untrained, whatever color they happen to be.

I believe that a properly designed, well-financed program of career education can turn this situation around. I would like to take a moment now to offer you our conception of career education as an instructional strategy, what it could be, and how it could work to strengthen the ability of the schools to prepare our millions of children for useful lives and perhaps do a better job of justifying the huge amount of money we now spend in this country for education.

Notice, please, my use of the subjunctive rule. I will describe what career education might be, not necessarily what it is or will be. Our intention is not in this sense to sell you on the particular issue. We are here to provide you with all the detailed information we have and to get your reactions to our presentations. But as Reggie said at the opening of this gathering, our purpose is to listen, to hear some ideas, and to explore some topics and issues. I have said all over this country again and again that career education must not be defined as a blueprint in Washington; if it is, it will never float. It must be hammered out across the country, by economic groups, labor groups, industrial groups, educational groups, governmental groups, in just such meetings as this. That is why I say that at least half of the purpose of this meeting is to find ways for us to listen and to respond to the council that is here assembled.

We are fully prepared to alter the program design that is put before you today and tomorrow, to revise it, restructure it, and reflect it in any way that will enhance its probability of success.

It has become abundantly clear in the past seven years that Washington has no magic insofar as educational ideas are concerned. If we are off target, we want to know it. I am persuaded that career education will change again and again and perhaps never assume a permanent form, as it continues to respond to a changing society and the society's changing needs. The final definition will be constructed not in Washington, but in the states and communities and by the practitioners themselves.

We conceive of career education as starting in kindergarten or first grade, although there would be no attempt to train students in occupations until the sixth grade. All we are aiming at in the elementary years is the development of awareness of careers, a personal realization that each student will spend most of his life doing or being something useful, and that something will be largely determined by work. Work may or may not carry economic motivations for all young people these days, but it is seen as the essence of a useful life.

Also, we want to give the young a sense of the remarkable number of options that will be opened to them, to inform them of the manifold ways by which adults in this society go about the business of living productively.

The latest Department of Labor **Dictionary of Occupational Titles** lists 23,000 different occupations. Obviously, we cannot hope to teach youngsters much about so great a number. However, we can group the great majority of those titles into clusters of related occupations that make sense to young people. A hospital orderly, a medical technician, a nurse, a brain surgeon, for example, are all related, and so we refer to these and many, many others as being in the health cluster. We have identified 15 such clusters. The others are agribusiness and natural resources, business and office, communications and media, consumer and homemaking, construction, environment, fine arts and humanities, hospitality and recreation, manufacturing, marine science, marketing and distribution, personal services, public services, and transportation. It is worth noting that the fine arts and humanities cluster includes poet, novelist, and artist. We are not trying to turn everybody into a machinist.

Clusters reduce the 23,000 occupational possibilities to a manageable number, so that we can develop curriculum materials around them. Inasmuch as most of the curricula effort at this point is being directed at a secondary level, most of the classroom activity for elementary-secondary education must come from the initiative and imagination of individual teachers. Some interesting things have been happening all around the country under our model development system.

In one Michigan community, for example, a fourth-grade teacher invited an industrial physicist from a nearby Pontiac plant to talk to her youngsters. His talk related conveniently to some of the concepts the class had been discussing in science. But in language arts, the youngsters had been discussing interviewing techniques for journalism. After the physicist put his equipment away, he was grilled by the class: How long did he have to go to college; was it important for the physicist to like science and math as a child; did he get good grades in those subjects in school; how much money did he make? It was a genuine interview motivated by honest interest and curiosity on the part of the young. There were real questions asked by youngsters who wanted to know something.

During the year, 19 additional adults in different occupations—the mayor, an electrician, an insurance salesman, a beautician—visited that one school, opening for the youngsters a window on the world in a real way that no amount of lecturing or reading could possibly have done. In our present culture, it is very difficult for a child to walk beside his father at the plow and learn about that kind of work. We are trying to find substitutes.

In seventh and eighth-grades, young people will move beyond this broad, occupational-awareness phase. By this time, they know something about all the clusters, and they can relate them to their own interests and lives. They have learned quite a bit, too, about their own aptitudes, which subjects they are good in, which ones they find the most fun in; they know enough about them and about careers, in short, to make a reasonable initial judgment about which of the 15 clusters appeals to them most and to choose several. We think that at that age, perhaps three is a good number of choices for more systematic exploration, as a youngster may choose to do.

And in ninth-grade, after two years of this gradually narrowing exploration, the youngster should know enough about the three occupational clusters he or she has been studying to make a tentative selection of one as a field for further, more concentrated career preparation.

It is important to underscore " tentative" here, since career education calls for open options, all ways, at all levels of learning, right on through college and universities. At no time should a learner at any age be locked into a career decision, except as such a decision is of his own making.

It is at this point, about age 13 or 14, that something undeniably and unblushingly recognizable as job training should begin. Our goal is that, during the last four years of schooling, ninth through twelfth grades, every boy and girl in school will develop entry-level job skills that qualify them for employment upon leaving school, whenever they leave. I repeat: every youngster, including those who intend to go on to college or some other form of post-secondary education. I mean the sons and daughters of bankers and brokers, as well as the sons and daughters of boilermakers and bellmen.

If, by tenth grade, a girl has decided that she wants to take a Ph.D. in molecular biology, fine. Not only are we for her, but we stand in awe of her discovering the field of work and understanding what it may mean. Recognizing the uncertain nature of life and the changeability of young minds and spirits, however, we want to give her a fall-back position if her plans don't work out, to make sure that she can qualify for a good job, even if she leaves high school before graduating.

Moreover, even if that job won't be at the level to which she originally aspired, at least she will have adequate skills in the occupational areas that interest her, in this case, the health cluster, perhaps as a licensed practical nurse or a laboratory technician.

And finally, if her circumstances do improve, she retains the options and the qualifications to return to her goal through academic training at any time, possibly years later.

This is a major point to be made about occupational clusters. Each cluster includes a range of employment opportunities to accommodate every type of aptitude, every level of intellect, every scale of ambition. The construction cluster, for instance, has room for young men (and, these days for young women) who prefer outdoor, manual work. This cluster also has room for entrepreneurs who aspire to operate their own contracting businesses, for skilled craftsmen in the construction trade, for engineers concerned with the strength of materials, for architects concerned with beauty and function, and for new specialties emerging in economic and other social sciences, not the least being new fields such as environmental science, urban planning, and new town management.

A few days ago, I watched a television interview with a Washington, D.C., high school student, aged 17. His name is Adrian Dantley. He works at basketball six hours a day, and many professional scouts are keenly interested in this young man. He said in the television interview—and I quote him—"I have just decided that I intend to be a professional basketball player and I am working at it. Some say that I am not very social," said Adrian. "Okay, you have to make sacrifices and I have made those sacrifices because I want to."

This is career education: a young man who knows what he wants to do with his life and who has taken hold of his own destiny. I know that somewhere—at least, I hope that somewhere—a wise coach or a teacher or a counsellor helped Adrian discover his talent, his giftedness, and helped him to see his capacities and make that career choice to build a life.

Thinking about occupations and careers, then, we have been careful to make room for the hands and the hammer and the honest skill it takes to drive a nail straight and the talent and desire to play a violin. But we give equal voice to the imagination and the spirit and the liberalizing function of all learnings, including the undergirding of academic subjects at all levels. These all are parts of one whole, each with its own dignity and importance. We make no apology for teaching a future architect what a carpenter does, or teaching the future carpenter the liberalizing joys of Robert Browning or Edna St. Vincent Millay or Baldwin, the poet.

It is well past time for our education institutions to help eliminate the phony snobbery and the pervasive prejudice related to the work that people do and to overcome the ideas passed on to some of us by our parents that certain jobs are worthy and certain are not, that some family heads are to be respected and other scorned, and that the best way to tell the difference is to see whether the wage earner owns a college degree and wears a tie to work.

By Grade 12 in our plans now, career education will have prepared every youngster for an entry-level job in the occupational cluster of his choice. We remind ourselves that 22 percent of our young people will drop out before high school graduation. Career education has just two goals: **first,** that every person shall leave secondary school able to get employment of interest and, most important, with good potential for advancement in every sense; and **second,** that those who choose will be able to go into some form of post-secondary education, whether a community or junior college, a two-year technical institute, or a four-year institution or professional graduate study.

We really hope that career education will eliminate the world "drop-out" from our language. There need not be more drop-outs. The student who leaves school at age 16 or 17 cannot be called a drop-out if the system is designed in such a way that the student may leave when he chooses and return when he chooses. He will leave because he is ready to leave and is equipped to leave. He spins out of the system and goes to work, and later spins back into it. He is accepted readily, continues on to higher education, and always keeps his options open.

Career education isn't just getting a job. That's part of it, but career education will, for the first time, give young people a sense of control over their own lives, a chance to shape their destiny in a systematic way, and the capability to say, "I am in charge and I know what I want to do with my life." It offers them significant solid information and experience to make it work.

There is much more to the career education design than I have spoken about today. John Ottina, who will be with you, and Tom Glennan, from the National Institute of Education, will outline for you the current state of our planning, model building and pilot testing activities in the Office of Education and in the National Institute of Education, the two agencies that share the husbandry of the federal role.

There also will be many opportunities today or tomorrow for you to explore our work in detail and to question its soundness and its value as it serves all young people, including minority young people. Indeed that is why we have come together.

As I mentioned at the beginning of these remarks, we expect that your observations, comments, and contributions will help to broaden and, in an increasing degree, to legitimize career education, if you find that you can believe in this message. It was for this same reason that, about a year ago, we assembled a panel of critics, objective scholars, and practitioners substantially unrelated to career education as it is now perceived, persons from all fields, and asked them to turn their specific talents and disciplines to a careful scrutiny of the proposition as it was emerging.

They represented such fields as anthropology, law, political science, sociology, mathematics, vocational education, philosophy, business, labor, counseling, and other dimensions. A number of minority scholars and practitioners served on that panel.

The most tangible result of their exertions is a book* that will be published and available, I am advised, in about two months. It will contain the reflections of these panelists on the career education notion, what they think of the idea, how they feel it should work, and how it could impact not only their

---

*McClure, Larry, and Carolyn Buan, eds. **Essays on Career Education,** Portland, Ore., Northwest Regional Educational Laboratories, under contract with the U.S. Office of Education/National Institute of Education, April 1973. 265 p.

particular field, but upon the entire spectrum of education, social, economic and occupational concerns that increasingly occupy Americans today.

The essays prepared by this panel of scholars offer a significant variety of opinion about career education. The authors probe, question, suggest, and examine, and the accumulative effect is certainly not one of a Pollyanna optimism; their words do convey a deep sense of hope concerning the subject. They see career education not only as an idea whose time has come, but as an idea that may well provide the essential theme for all education, both in and out of formal institutions for the foreseeable future.

In closing, I would like to draw upon a quote from that book, I referred earlier to Dr. Davenport as the former chairman of the Advisory Council on Vocational Education, and it was in that capacity that he contributed to this book an essay adapted from a speech that I heard him make earlier. There is a passage from it that I think strikes at the central theme of this meeting:

> "The concept of career education holds greater promise for Black students who attain a good education and preparation for interesting and constructive lives than any other development in recent years, including the Civil Rights Act, the Supreme Court decision, and all other decisions for improving education for Blacks. Career education is one approach which certainly deserves our close scrutiny."

I believe Dr. Davenport's sentiments apply not only to Black students and those of other minorities represented here today, but to all students. For all their sakes, then, I invite you to examine this idea with all the critical insight you can bring to bear. We do not have many chances left to make education work for all our children in this country. The road in the past 15 years is strewn with the burned-out hulks of vehicles that didn't make it, not because they weren't good ideas for education reform or good vehicles, but because not enough people believed in them and knew how to operate them.

If we truly mean what we have been saying for over a hundred years about equal educational opportunity, we had better get on with it now. The concept we are putting before you today is the best vehicle I know of to carry out this long overdue reform. But it has to belong to you, to all who care about education, and it can't be just one more dead Washington theory.

Panel: Implications of Career Education for Various Minority Groups

At 11 a.m. on Thursday, a panel presented a discussion on "Implications of Career Education for Various Minority Groups." The moderator was Dr. Candido De Leon, from the Puerto Rican American community. Other minorities were represented on the panel by: Todd Endo (Japanese American), Bernard Watson (Black American), Irving Shun Kee Chin (Chinese American), and Ruth Corcoran (Native American). Panelists expressed their concerns and fears regarding the implications and impact of career education. The following observations, excerpted from the transcript, are typical of the ideas expressed:

Mr. Todd Endo

Mr. Secretary Marland has said we could have nice intellectual discussions regarding the theory of career education, and I am not going to deny that. There are some real intellectual questions concerning the role of career education. But in fact, $100 million was given out for career education last year. A hundred-plus million dollars is going to be given out this year on career education. Many more million of dollars will probably be given out next year.

The thrust of what I want to say is that minority groups are really concerned with what comes out of the bottom of the pipe, not what Commissioner Marland and others say are the concepts of career education. What really happens in career education is up to the teachers in the classrooms, what they do with a kid, what curriculum they follow, what the guidance counselor tells a kid when he is in his office, what the school principal says, and what the person who got a grant from the Office of Education and NIE is doing.

We can discuss career education all day and all night, and it won't do any good. I would suggest that the conferees here take away from this conference more than a nice time and a stimulating discussion. They should take away a knowledge of how to get grants. Find out what projects are going on. Finally, I would say, use this conference for your own end — do not let the conference use you for its ends.

Mr. Bernard Watson

I think it is time that we began to understand that the implications of any educational program for minorities are directly related to what happens at the other end of the program. Just what the young man alluded to before, when he was talking about, not the input, but what comes out at the other end. What does a successful career education program (however that is defined) do for minorities, particularly the Blacks, when they come out at the end of the line?

Any program, particularly career education, must be related to the economic realities. Regardless of how successful a career education program is, if the economy is such tnat unemployment among young Blacks 21 and over continues at its present rate of 35 to 40 percent, it will not make any difference whether the program graduates are skilled and are prepared to go into any particular career field or not. That's the reality that Blacks and other minorities live with every day. I cannot deal with career education until we can reconcile its goals with economic realitiesof our country at this time.

Mr. Irving Shun Kee Chin

Career education is fine for those who speak English. But one must walk before one can run. Immigrant, both old and new, must learn English and become integrated and acculturated to America before career education becomes meaningful.

Prior to 1965, it was not simple for the Chinese immigrant to integrate into our great American society. The annual immigration quota for Chinese was restricted to 105 persons. Chinese were not accorded equal minority status and were therefore denied eligibility of participation in all funding. Now that discriminatory immigration laws have been revised, 10 to 16,000 Chinese join their families in the U.S. per year. This compounds the usual problems of housing, education, and employment, because the new arrivals gravitate to the already congested ghetto areas of Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco, and Boston, commonly called Chinatowns, because there they can use the Chinese language and find employment.

The basic problem is that Chinese Americans are considered by many as the "silent minority," because we did not verbalize our problems — not wanting to lose "face" — and now we find that when we do speak up, doors are slammed in our faces. We are told, "You are Chinese, you're not a minority." There was no way to seek judicial redress, as we had no rights. Finally, in the Education Bill of 1972, for the first time, Orientals are included in the statutory definition of minorities and are thus eligible for education program funding. We are now at the point where the Blacks and Puerto Ricans were many years ago. We join you now, hopeful that we can work together so that all minorities will be able to succeed. I am discovering, as New York City Commissioner of Human Rights, that we must speak up and fight for our rights.

I would like to make a second important point. Allusions have been made to the many engineers and Ph.D.'s who are looking for jobs because of aerospace cuts. But one should recognize that behind this circumstance is the fact that national priorities determine the availability of jobs. In other words, employment is set by the employers and not by the employees.

My point is simply that when you talk about career education, it is not the student who determines his future. Many times it is the national budget that determines job availability. Therefore, we cannot control our destinies as we would like.

Ms. Ruth Corcoran

I am very proud of my Indian background. I have lived on a reservation, and I have lived in the urban areas, and I have gained much from this, but I am very proud of my Indian-ness. I like my identity, and most Indian people are this way.

But how do I make other people respect me as an Indian? I can accomplish this to some extent when I give a talk in school, but it should be more than that. I think that what all of us here realize and what all of us must project when we get back is that minority groups are not monolithic. This is the mistake most people have made in the past. We have much in common, but also we have many differences. What works for some won't work for all. We must impress other people with this fact, because no one who isn't a member of a minority group can really appreciate the importance of this.

There should be more cultural sensitivity programs at the elementary and middle school levels. There should be more committees of parents to serve as a liaison between boards of education and minority groups. It should not be a case of an extra seat because you are a minority. These parents should have equal status, which includes voting rights.

Dr. Candido De Leon

We have heard of the similarities among minorities, we have heard of the differences, but the most apparent feature of American life for anyone who is a member of a minority group, regardless of his position or responsibilities, is to be held in fear, not to be trusted, to be unable to find a home, to be unable to find a job, unless somebody with all the credentials and everything else puts in a word. The fundamental issue is that we are not living as human beings here. And I just want to remind us of that. There is a lot more that could be said about what minorities experience. The focus of what we do from now on should be to begin to talk about providing an education which, as was mentioned a long time ago, has to do with the human use of human beings.

THURSDAY LUNCHEON ADDRESS

The Honorable Shirley Chisholm

On Thursday, February 1, the luncheon guest speaker was the Honorable Shirley Chisholm, Democrat from the 12th District of New York. She was introduced by Mr. Irving Shun Kee Chin of the New York City Human Rights Commission. Rep. Chisholm's presentation follows.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It's a pleasure to be with you here today as you discuss the implications for minorities of this new concept — career education.

The first point I want to make is that seeing representatives of minority groups getting together *before* a new educational concept is put into practice rather than *after* the damage, if any, has been done is very important. Throughout the history of American education, principles and practices have been formulated by educators without input from those to be affected — the teachers, the parents and the students we are trying to educate. Until public education became universal in our country, professional policy makers did not have to take into account the special needs and handicaps of minority groups in our population.

As we know, education in the early years of our republic was for the privileged few who could afford the time and expense it called for, rather than for the many who formed the backbone of the laboring classes who built this great nation. When the tide of immigration from Europe swelled during the last century, however, education was broadened as a tool to "Americanize" the millions of northern, southern, and eastern Europeans who came to these shores for a fresh start.

Schools in every city and town taught the children of these immigrants how to speak English, the preferred history of the United States, and how to drop their old-country ways in favor of the new American way. Public education has, by and large, achieved that goal during this century.

But while the schools were Americanizing the children of the European immigrants, they were ignoring the children of those other immigrants who were brought here by force — the African slaves, who came under less hopeful circumstances, and the Asians — and, most of all, those who were not immigrants at all, the Indians.

Today, it is time for the public schools to move out of the 19th century and into the 20th — indeed, the 21st century. While our system of education met the needs of society in the past, it has not been capable of meeting many current social needs. The majority of schools are suffering today because of what may be only a partly conscious effort to preserve the old idea of maintaining American culture as it was perceived long ago.

The early notion that education was for the elite no longer makes sense in a society that demands that every worker not only be able to read, write, and add two and two, but also adapt himself to a highly technological work force. The ultimate extreme of this trend occurs when a poorly educated product of our public school system is required to pass a civil service examination in order to become a janitor, street-cleaner, or hospital worker.

To put it bluntly, society has outdistanced the plodding public schools by a hare's pace. Change can come, however, by using the plodding turtle's cunning and determination to gear up, speed up, and get back out in front of the hare. And no one has a greater stake in urging that turtle on than the minority groups who traditionally have been cheated in this race.

But, make no mistake about it, we who represent the needs and aspirations of those previously neglected minority groups must remove ourselves from the sidelines. We must station ourselves both at the starting blocks and at the finish line, so that the turtle knows we helped him get where he must go, if our children are to be better served during this century *and the next* than they were during the last.

It is from this perspective, then, that we are here today to examine this new concept of career education. And we know that it is to this effort to update education that career education is attempting to address itself.

My role today is not to discuss the fine points of how career education is to be defined, how it should be implemented, or how it can be made to work. I will leave those important intricacies to those among you who are educational practitioners. What I want to do is sound some warning bells, to throw out some questions that come to mind on what career education is supposed to be.

One of the many definitions offered for the concept comes from the U.S. Office of Education:

> Career education is the total effort of public education and the community aimed at helping all individuals to become familiar with the values of a work-oriented society, to integrate these values in their lives in such a way that work becomes possible, meaningful, and satisfying to each individual.

Now, that's a real mouthful, and it is no wonder that there have been so many variations on that theme. But let me tell you how I react from a minority point of view to what is admittedly a very broad definition.

My first reaction is that career education is still designed primarily for middle-and working-class children and secondarily for disadvantaged children, in spite of the widely held assumption that it is most helpful to the young from very poor families.

Let me back up that assertion with an example.

In the Office of Education's own illustration of how elementary school children could be introduced to various careers, it is suggested that each child draw members of his or her family in their work roles. For example, "Father is—sometimes—a plumber; father is—sometimes—a judge; mother is—sometimes—a seamstress; mother is—sometimes—a chef; brother is—sometimes—a carpenter; sister is—sometimes—a decorator."

That is acceptable for those children whose relatives are actually engaged in a variety of careers. But what of those children who come from families where no one works in the traditional sense? They would have to draw pictures of a "Father who is—all the time—unemployed," or a "Mother who is—all the time—on welfare."

Perhaps brother makes a living as a hustler or sister survives as a streetwalker. For these children—and they are the ones at whom career education, at least in part, is aimed—the legitimate, respectable "world of work" does not exist within their own experience. Taught in this way, career education presents yet another identity crisis as they see a structure in which they can find no place to fit.

In another Office of Education document, there is an example of how students in junior and senior high school can weigh their interests against known aptitudes and test their skills in the marketplace. It is suggested here that they keep a folder containing an up-to-date resume, photocopies of work permits, birth certificate, social security card, and other essential data, as well as self-reports, biographical sketches, etc. This profile would be offered to prospective employers.

Once again, this suggestion does not seem to take into account the kinds of problems that many minority group students bring to the classroom and, by extension, to the work place. Should such a student include his police record in his folder, his health problems caused by living in substandard housing, an inadequate diet, poor medical care? Such idealistic exercises as preparing model resumes would not meet the needs of children who have been victims of such circumstances, and would perhaps retard them in their efforts to find a secure place in adult society.

Another aspect of career education relates to adults who are established in their work, and free to upgrade their skills and pass on their interests and talents to the next generation. "Work assumes a new dimension," for this adult, according to the career education model. He is expected to start a family and, to quote from the outline, "begin long-range planning for home ownership, household purchases, education and training."

But what about those young adults who become parents without benefit of marriage, upon whom the enormous responsibility of raising a child falls before they are prepared to exercise it? How many of these young men and women are in a position to buy a home, furnish that home, and consider further education and training? Does career education carried into adulthood include provisions for adequate child care, comprehensive health care, inexpensive yet sound housing, mass transportation, and all the other social services that are sorely needed by this segment of the population? If it doesn't, then career education will not work for those adults with whom many of us here today are concerned.

My point is that, as valid as the concept may sound, career education is being planned in a vacuum—a vacuum that does not include the other components of our society.

And this brings me to my second warning bell. That is, that unless the business and labor sectors of American society are as fully committed to career education *before it begins*, as is the education sector, the whole idea is doomed to failure. What good will it do for children to be brought from kindergarten through high school or college with the expectation that they are being prepared for a meaningful job, if they are turned away at the office or factory door?

I would suggest to you that not one of you commit yourself to career education as a cause *unless and until* you are convinced that those who monopolize the world of work are going to move over and make room for those who would wish to enter that world. And you should be convinced of that *now* to avoid the harsh realization that, once again, a whole generation of children has been led down a dead-end path.

Even if some youngsters succeed in overcoming these potential hurdles, there is evidence that career education, as presently envisioned, is geared strictly toward preparation for jobs as they exist today. What care is being taken to prepare our young for jobs that will exist in the year 2000 and beyond?

In its effort to help local educators plan for career education, the U.S. Office of Education has identified 15 occupational clusters, all of which are firmly rooted in the present or near future: agri-business and natural resources, business and office, communications and media, consumer and homemaking education, construction, environment, fine arts and humanities, health occupations, hospitality and recreation, manufacturing, marine science, marketing and distribution, personal services, public service, and transportation.

All of these occupations are—and no doubt will be—of great importance now and in the immediate years to come. But are there others that will be relevant to the mid-21st century in which children born today will live out their adult lives? I would want assurance that space technology is included; that cybernetics—the comparative study of automatic control systems between man and machine—is included; that the future of these children will include safeguards against the development of human automatons, such as Aldous Huxley darkly foresaw in *Brave New World*.

In other words, career education must look far into the future, a future that is closer to our children that it is to us. Career education must place a high priority on thinking as a full-time occupation. A man or woman 10, 20, or 50 years from now should be paid—as are a few today—to spend all his or her time thinking—thinking of ways to make society fully humane for all of its members, indeed, thinking of ways to keep society human. Children must be educated to become full-time philosophers, planners, theologians, writers, and guardians of those aspects of our old-fashioned moral code that are timeless—the belief that each individual is equal in the eyes of his God, and that every person has a right to live as fully as his capabilities permit.

Finally, I would sound my last warning bell against the very likely possibility that those twin evils—racism and sexism—may be built into career education. All the careful planning and curriculum development in the world will be lost, if prejudice against minority group persons or female persons is allowed to pervade the world of work in the future, as it does today. If businesses and unions are allowed to restrict the advancement of well-qualified persons on the basis of color, national background, or sex, then career education will go only as far as the commencement ceremonies. Girls must be encouraged to go into traditionally male occupations, and boys must be freed from believing that child care is "woman's work." And no amount of preparation will ready a Black, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Puerto Rican, Chicano, or Indian child to meet rejection because of his heritage.

In summary, I would urge you to discuss the questions I have raised, as well as the questions I'm sure each of you has in mind as you go into your workshops and seminars to examine more closely the procedural aspects of career education.

Thursday Afternoon Session

Dr. Thomas Glennan

Dr. Thomas Glennan, director of the National Institute of Education, addressed the Thursday afternoon general session of the conference, saying:

I am delighted to be here today to talk about what I know and think about career education, and to describe the program of the National Institute of Education.

The NIE is a new agency which was established by law in the middle of last year. It came into being officially on the 1st of August in 1972. As detailed by the Congress in our enabling legislation, we have four major purposes or functions. We are first to help solve or alleviate the problems of and achieve the objectives of American education. We are to advance the practice of education as an art, as a science, and as a profession. We are to strengthen the scientific and technological foundations of education, and to find ways to build an effective educational and research development system. That's a large task and it's also pretty comprehensive, and I have been hard pressed in finding something I couldn't do in that mandate.

The Institute is a part of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Education Division within it, and occupies a parallel position to the Office of Education; John Ottina and I occupy parallel positions within that division. We report to the Secretary of HEW through Sidney Marland as the Assistant Secretary for Education.

The establishment of the NIE represents a belief on the part of both the Administration and Congress that a sustained and systematic investment and research, development, testing, and publicizing of education ideas and techniques will have a substantial payoff in terms of improved education. The words in that sentence each have an important meaning.

First, I would emphasize that this is a belief. Our experiences in that field of education and research development, while not all unproductive, have not been outstanding. There are, for example, few conspicuous successes in the area of compensatory education. There is little indication that research on teacher effectiveness has improved the training of teachers or their performance in the classroom. This is where the Institute must prove itself and, until it does, it is proper for you and others in the society to remain skeptical about the value of what we are trying to accomplish.

Second, we are talking about sustained activities. Part of the problem with past research development in edcuation may have been its instability and unevenness: fads were supported for short periods of time and then abandoned; projects were started, but not actually developed; and frequently, programs were not evaluated. Many research activities were begun with little or no planning and, as a consequence, were either ill-conceived or ill-applied.

The Institute has hopes of bringing a measure of stability and sustained support to career education and to other areas chosen for research investment.

Third, the term "systematic" implies a need to think a problem through before attempting to deal with it, or at least to start thinking it through before starting to deal with it. It involves the need to consider and define, to identify techniques to be used, including the type of organizations and individuals required to carry out these activities, and finally to know how and by whom these results could be used. Isolated demonstration projects, which have been so frequently a part of research and development in the social program areas, do not seem to me to be an effective way to develop program concepts.

Finally, the Institute is going to be concerned with research and development, the testing of ideas, and the publicizing or dissemination of these ideas.

We will not primarily be a basic research institution. We are not another NIH, for example. We will not be solely concerned with the development of new projects or specialized facilities.

We are interested in the work of both specialists in research and skilled practitioners, and in the contributions they can provide in program development. We believe strongly that we must present some evidence of the worth of programs we and others have developed before recommending their adoption. As a consequence, evaluation and testing will be an important part of our mission. Following evaluation, we must be very concerned with linking the approved program with the practice ultimately occuring in the field.

When the National Institute of Education was initiated, it inherited a large number of programs from the research component of the Office of Education. A substantial part of this inheritance was career education activities begun over the last two years. Within the Institute, we have created a task force on career education, led by Corinne Reider, who is here with you today. It has been responsible for monitoring and directing the existing programs as well as planning new ones. This task force has been working for the past month both to understand the directions of existing work and to pinpoint needs in the field and places where NIE can best make some contribution.

Career education is, of course, a tremendously broad concept that can cover an enormous range of things within the realm of education—indeed, perhaps, all of education. We can, however, give our development efforts some sense of focus and we are trying to do so. Thus, we have defined, for the purposes of our research, career education as providing individuals with the knowledge, capabilities, and attitudes necessary to interact successfully with the economic sector.

We are concerned with helping people to enter the labor market with a level of capability that will permit progression within a vocation in the most satisfying and financially rewarding way that is possible.

Beyond that, we will focus on a couple of very important areas. The major focus of our activity is on youth. By youth, we mean, roughly, people from the ages of 12 to 25. This age group is noteworthy for its high unemployment and its need for career direction. It is at this age that first contacts with the economic sector typically occur. It is a time during which individuals switch their dependency on family and school to independence in society in the job market. In short, it is a terribly crucial time to the life of any individual.

There have been rapid changes in the characteristics of this age group over the past decade. Increasing percentages of our youths are completing high school; thus credentials that were rare four or five decades ago are common today, while ever larger proportions of this population are seeking some form of post-secondary education.

Yet, we still have very, very high unemployment figures, figures that would be even larger if our statistics reflected the number of people who have simply dropped out of the system and choose not to even seek work. Not only are the figures large in general, but they are disproportionately large for minorities. Clearly then, the broad problem of trying to help people in this age group has become economically critical; yet it is not being dealt with satisfactorily, particularly for minority youths.

The second area our career education program emphasizes involves individuals in their prime working age who, for one reason or another, would like to change career patterns: the housewife who wants to re-enter the labor market or perhaps enter it for the first time, or the individual who has become mired in one career, feels himself at a dead end, and seeks something quite new and different.

Our system is not well equipped to deal with these individuals. Taken as a whole, the post-secondary educational system—while providing some opportunities and developing what I would call "cross-over skills"—is still largely focused on the problems of the traditional college student. The labor market, dependent upon credentials, does not provide rewards for competency gained through job experience, especially when the experience is not directly related to some career path.

The needs of these two groups, then, seem to us to deserve significant attention from policy makers and research and development personnel.

The major focus of NIE efforts is on four model programs intended to develop and demonstrate institutional ways to provide career education. Let me review them briefly.

First, the school-based model involves the development and testing of elementary and secondary curriculum materials. In the elementary grades, these materials would emphasize awareness of various career alternatives. In the intermediate grades, they explore opportunities in the areas developed, provide greater depth of knowledge, and in high school, provide specific preparation for career opportunities. The curriculum materials developed are based upon the assumption that they can be incorporated into the educational system without requiring radical shifts in the system's organization.

The second model, one that intrigues me particularly, is the employer-based model. It is being conducted or developed by four regional labs in conjunction with a number of employer consortia. This model is intended to provide educational experiences within the actual place of employment. The hypothesis underlying this program is the belief that current public school programs are irrelevant to social and economic realities, or at least viewed as irrelevant by many young people. Relevant learning for many adolescents must be experiential, and employers should be capable of providing such experiences, given the proper incentives.

These activities must be viewed as pilot tests or trials. We are experimenting with new organizational mechanisms. We are seeking to understand where financial resources for such education can be obtained, considering how the programs should be administered and how this kind of educational experience will be accepted by students and potential employers.

The third major objective or model is the home-based model. Here we are seeking ways to deliver career education services to people who are not in the educational system or job environments where career educational opportunities are available. The first test is underway in Rhode Island. Unlike other models, it does not attempt to teach skills or attitudes directly. Rather, the project attempts primarily to inform individuals about working and training opportunities that already exist within the community. It also intends to use the communications media to assess career interests of selected home-based population.

The project assumes that there is a significant number of adults who are not students, employed, or actively seeking to find employment, but who are unsatisfied with their present situations and need career assistance. It is also assumed that there is a wide variety of career training resources already existing, and that ignorance concerning the resources' existence is a major career-related problem of these individuals. I presume also advocacy on their behalf in getting access to those resources. In reality, the home-based model comes closest to the kind of unified social services' concept that former Secretary Elliot Richardson strenuously advocated, and represents the belief that many of our problems stem not so much from the absence of good services as from inability to integrate and use them in meeting the needs of our population.

The final model involves developing residential training and counseling focused on rural families, rather than on single individuals. This model assumes that formal school interventions alone are not sufficiently powerful to help poor families. It also assumes that the problems of many families go beyond the lack of specific job skills on the part of an adult member, but include lack of household management skills, health and nutrition knowledge, child care capability, and so forth. Finally, it is assumed that these families can best be helped by moving them, for a period of time at least, from their present environment into a controlled residential environment.

The primary problem with this kind of program, as you can well imagine, is its great cost, but if it significantly improves the well being of these families, it may ultimately turn out to be a cost-effective venture.

While these programs represent the bulk of our financial commitment at this point, they by no means represent the bulk of the nation's investment in these kinds of activities. For this reason, NIE proposes to pull together the wealth of research and program materials that have been produced across the country, describe them, and make those descriptions available to interested institutions and school systems.

We are exploring ways to provide information on the quality of these products. It is clear that we cannot evaluate them all, but it seems important that we be concerned with the problem of quality control.

A major research problem is that the quality of our measures of outcome are very poor, particularly the approximate measures. One of the major tasks of the Institute must be to develop measures that not only can help us produce better materials, but can help practitioners and organizations carrying out these kinds of activities to assess their performance.

As we contemplate the expanse and continuation of our program over the next few years, we expect to place somewhat greater emphasis on the post-secondary school area. We will begin this process, I think, by studying the opportunities to switch careers as well as institutional barriers to these changes. The degree to which current institutions, such as community colleges and the emerging universities, are providing educational support for these career paths will be examined. The financing of this type of career educational activity must be explored. To what extent should the public, the individual, or the employer bear these costs?

For both the youth and adult areas, we want to spend considerable time and effort in understanding the context of career education. I notice that it is a particular concern of yours and one I share, because the best educational system in the world cannot achieve the goals many hold out for career education, if the labor market lacks opportunities for sustained advancement, and if there is discrimination in the manner in which entry-level jobs are filled or in which career progression opportunities are provided. I think, therefore, that the Institute must assess and perhaps extend research on the behavior of labor markets, particularly as they affect youths, but indeed as they affect all of you.

We must look at why some people seem to have continuing career progression and why others become mired in dead-end jobs. We must also examine the way in which credentials are used in our society. This is not a barren field, as you know only too well.

In my experience, both the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Labor have supported significant research that can be applied to career education strategies. Such research is likely to suggest that we need to seek a partnership between employers and the educational system: one in which both make significant changes in the way they carry out their affairs.

In conclusion, let me try to state the aspirations I have for the career education program within the National Institute of Education. I do hope that we can clearly define the problems that inhibit successful access to and performance in the economic sector by important segments of the national population. In this process, we must consider both individual problems, such as lack of skills, knowledge, and attitudes, and the problems inherent in our labor market—its rigidities, discriminatory practices, and emphasis on irrelevant credentials.

We must seek strategies to overcome these problems and, where necessary, create the program models to carry out those strategies. In the long run, this will require, in my judgment, a partnership between the employer and the educational system.

Finally, in carrying out these objectives, we must seek to include a wide range of interests and competencies. The involvement of people such yourselves is important both to our understanding of the problems perceived and experienced by different parts of our society, and to our accomplishing this reform. For the kinds of efforts that we may support to have any usefulness, the public must understand what it is we are doing and why we are doing it; indeed, you must participate and feel that you have been able to influence the direction of this work.

And so, I can derive from the conference some kind of guidance. It is important for you to note that we are in a period of reformulation within the Institute, a period of seeking new directions. It is particularly appropriate that you come together at this time to discuss these problems. I look forward to having the opportunity to learn from you some of the difficulties that you think that we have, and the changes we ought to be making.

Dr. John Ottina

Acting Commissioner of Education and spokesman for the Office of Education's initiatives in career education. Dr. John Ottina was the next speaker of the afternoon.

Despite some changes in administrative responsibilities and some budgetary belt tightening, I can assure you that career education is alive and well in the Office of Education and, if anything, is moving ahead with accelerated vigor and vitality.

True, the four national career education models have moved to NIE as Tom Glennan described. True, dissemination activities that were formerly housed in OE's National Center for Educational Communications, including those that dealt with career education, have also been transferred to NIE.

Moreover, it's true that the Office of Education, along with other federal agencies, will undoubtedly operate for the rest of this fiscal year and probably next fiscal year on a budget that will require some very careful decisions on how best to allocate our resources.

Within this budgetary framework, however, I believe I can say without reservation that career education is now and will remain a top priority in the office. I really don't see how it could be anything else.

In the first place, there is acute awareness of the federal responsibility to help education regenerate the reform both in institutional management and classroom instruction that will come closer to meeting student demands for relevance and the taxpayers' demands for fiscal responsibility.

In the second place, given their enthusiastic response to the career education concept in the last two years, I doubt that educators, industry and labor leaders, civic and ethnic groups, students, or parents would let us back off. Sid Marland touched a resounding chord in the national psyche when he began to call some 26 months ago for career orientation to be provided to every student in our schools and colleges. The objective would be establishment of programs that would enable every student to choose a career he really wants and receive training that would allow him to succeed.

That's a mammoth proposition, and I would be less than candid if I left the impression that career education is going to rise like a phoenix overnight and transform the career options and aspirations of this country's entire school and college population. We are talking about a curriculum restructuring that would help every one of the 54 million children in our elementary and secondary schools plus another estimated eight million in post-secondary programs, and help them to select and prepare for careers that our own Department of Labor has catalogued as amounting to 20,000 distinct occupations. Our efforts in OE have been aimed at the development of clusters of occupations; and, as you are all aware, we have identified some 15 career clusters.

It is going to take time, commitment, and money, but we are anxious to move ahead with installation of instructional units in as many schools and colleges as possible just as soon as these units have been adequately tested. We just can't afford to let the current situation continue with the graduation from formal education of two-and-a-half million young people annually without a marketable skill or career goal. At the same time, we should recognize that the true test of career education's success or failure as an integral and worthwhile part of the learning process is still some years down the road. The real test will come when students leave their formal education and start looking for jobs in their chosen field. There is a major need for research, through longitudinal studies, to examine how we are meeting career education goals, whether students do enter their chosen fields, are retained, and do grow, as we have pledged they would.

A little later, I would like to touch briefly on some of the promising initiatives that we are supporting in the Office of Education to get career education off the ground. I suspect that Bill Pierce, our new Deputy for Occupational and Adult Education, will be more specific in commenting on individual activities. Bill has additional responsibility to coordinate all career educational activity within the educational division.

I would like to comment on one or two of the concerns that surround the concept of career education. Like most large and untried ideas, career education has doubters and disbelievers. I welcome the opportunity that this afternoon affords to learn some of the things that trouble your constituencies. Your policies and recommendations will be earnestly and seriously considered in charting our further course.

I further hope that the state and local school districts would give similar consideration to your concerns in making their policy and program decisions. This is important because, although the federal government can provide seed money for innovation and reform, the real thrust and the money that's spent on career and all of the education programs come from state and local sources.

Some concerns about the career education concept have been expressed by organizations that many of you represent—the AFL/CIO, liberal arts educators, the Urban League, and the educational press. Dr. Marland wrote a concise summation of the issues in his introduction to a book of essays by our panel critics, and I would like to quote a brief passage. Reviewing some of the early developments of the notion of career education in the Office of Education, he asked many of the questions you have asked.

> "Were we bent upon an anti-intellectual azimuth that would deny the historic meaning of the liberal arts? Were we so preoccupied with occupational fulfillment that we endangered the ultimate educational goal ideal of personal, social, emotion and humanistic fulfillment? Were we thoughtlessly extolling the virtues of technical education to the corresponding implied disparagement of the liberal arts institutions? Were we seeking to trap minority students into blue collar jobs at the time when college doors were being opened wider? Were we accentuating the 'work ethic' at a time when so many young people believed they had found a nobler motivation than economic gain?"

I think one thing comes through loud and clear. We have not been using the English language to the best advantage; we have not been communicating with youths as well as we should. The answer to each one of these questions, at least as we see them in the Office of Education, is a resounding NO, this is not what we are trying to do.

Career education was never intended to devalue a liberal arts education or stress occupational preparation at the expense of personal and humanistic development. It certainly is not an approach designed to trap minority students into blue collar jobs, to deny them the advantages of college education, or to place undue emphasis on the "work ethic." The truth lies in the absolute reverse of these negative assumptions, and there is a touch of irony in the fact that a reform effort such as career education is identified by some with the very wrongs it was trying to correct.

Career education simply means that every student should be aware of all sorts of career options: that the son of a hotel manager might want to follow in his father's footsteps, but he should be aware of other vocations that he may pursue, such as forester, oceanographer, or attorney.

Think back to your days as a teenager. How many careers did you know about? I couldn't have imagined what I have gone through in the last 20 years, for instance. And I did not understand at the time that I was in high school nor when I entered college how these academic experiences would prepare me for the world.

A second thrust is to motivate and prepare every young person to go as far and as fast as his interests and capabilities will take him. If he selects a career that requires four years or two years of college, then college is an essential step in his career development and his high school preparation and his guidance counselor should lead him in this direction. But our young people should not be encouraged these days to go to college just for the prestige and the so-called status that a college education provides. Higher education is costly, time consuming, and it does not necessarily lead to and shouldn't lead to the skills for all of our youth.

I understand that Shirley Chisholm talked with you today, and I would like to take a quote from her in a little pamphlet that was entitled, "Comments on Career Education," where she says, "A degree should not be sought as it is by most students now as a union card to admit them to an upper middle-class occupation."

If anything, the union card of the 1970's and the 1980's for the majority of young people is not a four-year degree, just as it's not a high school diploma. The Department of Labor's projections say that, by the end of the decade, four out of every five jobs will not require a four-year degree.

What is often lost is the other half of this projection; that most of the jobs will require training beyond high school. In other words, the new technologies and service industries have created a new middle ground of job opportunity that calls for one or two years of training beyond high school, but does not require a traditional four-year college degree.

Blue collar jobs as we have known them in the past are fast disappearing, all of which says we need to stop indoctrinating our young people with a notion that any career aspiration not based on an academic or professional degree is demeaning, somehow unworthy of becoming one's life goal. To continue this fallacious idea is a disservice to our young people. And you as leaders have a responsibility to help turn the tide of public opinion.

Let me now turn to some of the projects and programs related to the career education programs being supported by the Office of Education. While the research and development initiatives for career education have moved to NIE, the office continues major efforts to develop curriculum units and support demonstration projects in every state and territory. For instance, grants have been awarded to some of the nation's top curriculum specialists to develop high school instructional programs for five to fifteen career clusters that I mentioned earlier.

Clusters now being developed are Construction, Manufacturing, Transportation, Public Service, and Communications and Media. Pilot testing of these programs is scheduled for the school year 1973-1974.

Looking ahead, I suspect we will support the development programs for the other clusters of high school levels in the next couple of years and at the same time extend the instructional projects for the first five clusters into the junior high and elementary grades and up to post-secondary education.

Along with cluster materials, we are also supporting development of related curriculum, for instance, programs in such new technologies as electromechanics, nuclear medicine, and bio-medicine.

There are career education programs on the drawing boards for gifted and talented children in consumer education, for the nation's conversion to the metric systems, and even for nursery school.

Starting on April 2nd and running through mid-May, *Captain Kangeroo*, the television program that has cornered the attention of young children for 17 years, will run twice a week a series of four-minute films on career clusters designed for youngsters three to six years of age. The series is called, "The World That Could Be."

It has a wizard and children of many races exploring the world of farming, environment, homemaking, and so on. We all are aware that the pre-school years are not too early to start career orientation for children and we have been very pleased to support this undertaking.

On another front, we have recognized that teachers have their own creative ways of interpreting and expanding on basic curriculum materials and that their understanding of career education is critical to successful implementations.

And some exciting things are happening here in the District of Columbia; for example, we have funded some projects to help career education stress community involvement with assistance from local business, industry, and service agencies.

Seniors in ten academic high schools who do not plan to enter college, immediately, at least, are getting occupational skills that will prepare them for rewarding careers upon graduation.

Last summer, the school system had entertained the hope that it might recruit 500 seniors for the program. In the end, the publicity and campaign they mounted in cooperation with the Board of Trade proved so effective that it had to make room for more and has currently enrolled 530 students.

Out in the states that flank the continental divide, we are supporting another promising endeavor that combines educational innovation and space technology. NASA plans to launch an experimental satellite in the Rockies next April to test satellites as television relays in remote areas.

One thing the satellite would test is the feasibility of bring career education into homes and into schools on Indian reservations and other remote communities. With our support, the Federation of Rocky Mountain States is developing a career awareness program for this TV transmission. And I think it speaks for the state of the art that satellites will carry four audiograms, which means that with the twist of a sound dial the TV that brings in one visual picture can give you the sound narrative in Navajo, Spanish, or English.

No exposition of the growing development toward career education would be complete without mention of state and local initiatives. A number of states and local school districts clearly believe that career education is the way to go.

For example, the legislatures of Arizona, Florida, and North Carolina are each putting up $3 million a year to help school districts to convert to career education.

Wyoming and Georgia are also heavily committed. Dallas—in appropriate Texas style—is converting on its own, and other cities are fast reaching the same conclusion.

So it's clear that career education is indeed alive and well, both in the Office of Education and in the states and localities. But what we need to do now is make sure that it serves the interests and aspirations of every youngster in every school in the nation.

Thursday Small Group Sessions: Educational Models and Programs

Following the afternoon session and a coffee break, discussion groups met to discuss "Educational Models and Programs." The topics covered by the nine sessions were: The School-Based Model; The Employer-Based Model; The Home/Community-Based Model; The Rural Residential Model; Model Building (Mini-Models); Curriculum Development; Pre-Service and In-Service Teacher Education; Career Education Information Dissemination; and Urban Education Career Education Center/OIC. Reports from these discussion groups are incorporated into the resolutions presented in Section V.

Thursday Afternoon General Session, Panel: Funding Career Education (State and Federal): Where Do the Funds Come From?

At the late afternoon general session (4:45 PM), a panel discussion on "Funding Career Education (State and Federal): Where do the Funds Come From?" was held. Laplois Ashford, vice-president of the National Urban Coalition's Urban Education Division, served as moderator. Panelists were: Dr. William F. Pierce, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education; Robert H. Arents, Supervisory Consultant for Career Education, New Jersey State Department of Education; Mary Aravale, Career Education Task Force, California State Department of Education; Jack Jen[illegible], General Counsel, General Subcommittee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, John Warren, Majority Counsel, Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives; and Dr. Robert Reischauer, Brookings Institution.

Time constraints limited the full panel from making presentations. However, because of the interest expressed in funding for career education, those that were made are included here in their entirety, with only slight editing of extraneous material.

For the question-and-answer period that followed, an attempt has been made by the editors to reduce what sometimes were long, involved discussions to more succinct queries and responses. While no identification is made of the person asking a question, the editors felt it important to identify the respondents, who were in most cases government officials.

Mr. Laplois Ashford

The moderator, Mr. Ashford, opened the panel session with some remarks on the 1974 federal budget and its implications for domestic social programs, as follows:

My role this afternoon is that of a moderator and I want to begin with a statement of concern, setting the atmosphere in which I think this most vital discussion should be held. We know that we are talking about funding career education, both on the state and federal level, and also about the sources from which the funds come.

High on the list of national concern, especially during the last few days, has been the proposed budget for fiscal year 1974. With reference to this budget, it is a tragic irony of our nation that, at the moment when it has reached the threshold of peace in Vietnam and Indochina, the prospect of domestic programs and stability should be so bleak and discouraging. There will be no postwar peace dividend to meet the urgent requirements and responsibilities for all of us to solve high-priority domestic problems; on the contrary, we find the defense budget is to be increased by $4.6 billion.

We have already experienced during this fiscal year the impoundment of over $12 million from funds that were originally appropriated to meet some domestic needs in the areas of health, education, social services, housing, and economic development.

In addition, we have recently undergone a freeze on a variety of other domestic programs, including subsidized housing, housing for low- and moderate-income persons, and all but one of the manpower training and job development programs.

The recently released 1974 federal budget will sustain many of these cutbacks, as well as eliminate many social programs that have successfully provided equal opportunity and more justice to the country's poor, near poor, and disadvantaged over the past decade. It will also adversely affect the working poor, the aged, and even moderate-income people who have been continually struggling to create a better tomorrow for their children.

Now, as we look at these cutbacks and look at the list of social action programs that have been either eliminated or severely cut back and as we read the newspapers, it seems as though we are reading a modern horror story. Fiscal restraints are no doubt necessary in times of inflation, but I believe and I hope that many of you out there today would be in agreement with me, that there are better alternatives than the elimination and reduction of federal programs vital to domestic and urban problems.

So, we come today to another important and urgent yet rather confusing domestic program, that is, career education, and we want to ask further questions about the implications for all of us, especially those of us who are minorities.

Dr. William F. Pierce

Mr. Ashford then introduced Dr. William F. Pierce, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education of the U.S. Office of Education, whose comments follow:

As you know, since 1969 when Sidney Marland first made the career education thrust a top priority in the Office of Education, he and his colleagues within the Office of Education have made certain, whenever appropriate, possible, and within the Congressional intent, that discretionary funds within the Office of Education were utilized to expand and to enhance the concept of career education.

He successfully advanced the idea to all his colleagues and to all the people in the Office of Education that all the OE-sponsored programs, irrespective of whether they dealt with youngsters at a certain age level, certain groups of people, or specific academic disciplines, had a responsibility and must logically assist in financing the implementation of career education, because it cuts across all of the Office of Education programs. As a result, career education has received support from the following programs over the past few years: six distinct parts of the Vocational Education Act of 1968; Talent Search and Upward-Bound, the special services for disadvantaged college students; cooperative education portions of Title IV of the Higher Education Act; dropout prevention funds under Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Act; Parts D and F of the Education and Secondary Education Act; Parts D and F of the Education Profession's Development Act; the Cooperative Research Act; and National Institute of Education (NIE).

Specifically, from what particular kinds of programs have these funds come? To begin with, much of the impetus for the broad, locally-based developmental efforts in career education has come through Parts C and D of the Vocational Education Act of 1968. Part C, as you probably know, provides funds for research and development work in vocational education, including the conduct of experimental and private projects. On the other hand, Part D funds provide for the operation of three-year programs designed to familiarize elementary and secondary education students with specific skills required in the world of work and to broaden and improve specific occupational programs from the 10th to the 14th grade, with an emphasis on counseling, guidance, and placement.

With these programs as a vehicle, Sidney Marland in 1972 committed $8 million of Part D money to the implementation of a career education program in every state and territory of this United States.

In September 1971, he also committed $9 million from Part C, Research Funds, to add one additional program within each state and territory having to do with the implementation of career education.

John Ottina mentioned earlier today that, from Part I funds of the Vocational Education Act (designed for curriculum development), we have embarked upon developing a curriculum in five of the fifteen predetermined clusters.

Dr. Marland also examined available OE discretionary funds, and in 1972, $1.7 million of Cooperative Education funds and $2 million of Drop-Out Prevention funds were made available to career education, and $6.9 million of EPDA funds were utilized specifically to fund career education projects. None of these findings or their use was antithetical to the purpose of the funds. Because the career education concept is broad, addressing itself to dropouts, children, youth, and adults, the utilization of these funds to implement the career education concept in every aspect of education is consistent with the intended use of these funds.

As a result of these and other commitments from the Office of Education, during 1972, approximately $114 million were specifically earmarked for the implementation of career education projects around the country.

What can we look forward to in 1973? Early in the budget cycle, the Office of Education requested an additional $55 million for career education implementation through 1973.

As you know, the President is concerned about the budget. As Mr. Ashford pointed out, he has suggested and said that we will hold to the $250 billion level in 1973 and to $268.7 billion in 1974. If these funding levels hold fast—and there is no reason to believe at this moment that they will not—many programs, by necessity, will go unfunded, or at best, only partially funded. But even with these constraints, our latest survey for 1973 suggests that an additional commitment of more than $28 million above and beyond that for 1972 has already been made from higher education funds. There also have been commitments from other projects, and continuing commitments to career education. As a result, if you use the same assumptions that undergirded the $114 million estimated for 1972, it now appears that, even in a year of extremely tight budgets throughout the state government and federal government, career education funds will be expanded during 1973 to approximately $140 million.

Obviously, it is too early to project very far into 1974, except to say that the budget does show for the first time an additional $14 million specifically earmarked for the implementation and promotion of career education through the Cooperative Research Act.

Another question raised, in addition to where the funds come from, is: For what purpose are they being used?

As Tom Glennan and others who work in NIE have said, the funds have been used for model development and testing, and for the installation and demonstration of a comprehensive program that would unify an entire school operation around the career education concept.

Some 100 school districts in this nation now have that kind of a program being developed and experimented with. They hve been used to test and demonstrate the desirability and practicality of a strong counseling, guidance, and placement program at all levels—elementary, secondary, and certainly post-secondary. The programs have been used for curriculum development projects at every level and in a wide variety of the traditional disciplines.

They have been used for attempts to reorient the thinking of actual and potential dropouts in the school systems; to train counseling and guidance personnel; to demonstrate the adaptability of post-secondary education to the career education concept; for in-service education of trainers and teachers and university administrators; and finally, for promoting and developing understanding of the career education concept through conferences such as this, with business people, educators, and leaders from around the nation.

One of my responsibilities is to bring about career education and continue to promote and implement it throughout the United States. Obviously, we can't do that without your support and without knowing what it is that concerns you. If we can't address ourselves to your concerns, the career education concept really is not worthwhile. But I am convinced that we can indeed address to these concerns and make whatever adjustments and changes that are necessary.

One might ask, "Why haven't we spent more money on career eduation, if it is such a vital process?" Should the federal government totally fund the career education concept in this country? To me, the answer to that question is obvious: Of course not.

Career education is not a *program* that you fund; it is a *concept*. As we would not expect the federal government to fund the existing educational system, we certainly should not expect it to totally fund a reoriented, revised educational system designed around career education.

The role the Office of Education has tried to play up to this point is to serve as a catalytic agent, to use funds where they need to be used for the initial development of programs and to answer initial questions. We need to demonstrate and share with you programs that have been successful and identify those that have not been successful.

The funds have been used well as a catalyst and it seems to me that now you are asking: "Are there other ways that you ought to be using these moneys to address more specifically certain groups of youngsters and adults?" And that's why we are here today. Thank you.

At the conclusion of Dr. Pierce's speech, the moderator, Mr. Ashford, posed the following question for his consideration during the question-and-answer period: "In light of recent cutbacks in social programs and the elimination of others, are we to believe that career education opportunities are to be completely divorced from all other social action programs?" *(Dr. Pierce's response appears on* p. 29)

Mr. Robert H. Arents

The next speaker was Robert H. Arents, supervisory consultant for career education for the New Jersey State Education Department, whose address follows:

I speak for Governor William Cahill and Commissioner Carl Marberger when I say that New Jersey is indeed honored to be invited to this conference, not only as a participant, but also as a presenter of Governor Cahill's career development program.

Before I make any comment on the program itself I want to make a distinction between career education and career development. These terms are often employed interchangably without regard to their true meaning.

In New Jersey, career development is a concept that pertains to the occupational needs of an individual, while career education is a process of education that pertains to the totality of curriculum experiences.

Career development is the result of career education experiences. It should be noted that career development was the original term used in New Jersey at the time enabling legislation was passed and is still applicable. However, New Jersey is still moving further ahead in the area of career education. Vocational education, which has played a vital role in career development efforts in New Jersey and spearheaded an attack on irrelevant educational programs existing in our schools, will continue to play a vital role. However, responsibility for a more comprehensive career education concept will have to come through the cooperative efforts of many people in both the public and private sector at state and local levels.

In keeping with this, there has been appointed within the New Jersey Department of Education a representative task force to develop a policy statement on career education, as well as strategies for gaining statewide implementation of the concept.

Additionally, a gubernatorial task force has been meeting to develop a master plan on economics in career education. This task force represents a large cross-section of the private sector, with some input from the educational community.

To appreciate what New Jersey is currently doing in terms of career development, it is necessary to review the circumstances surrounding vocational education specifically and education in general in New Jersey.

Historically, New Jersey in 1965 became one of the first states to implement a career exploration program with a "hands-on" emphasis for junior high school students, in cooperation with business and industry.

The next year, New Jersey developed the first statewide elementary program to combine career education with academic studies, as well as a career exploration program for the educable mentally retarded. In 1967, the state designed the first mobile learning tool cart for use in children's career development programs.

The first appointment of a career development director at the State Department level was made in 1968 and a year later, the first truly individualized learning stations were developed for children's career education programs.

Similarly, a career resource center for comprehensive kindergarten-through-12th-grade career development project was first established in 1970, as was the first comprehensive career development project and the first federal state-local joint funding of a project for children's career exploration.

All of these things were taking place largely as a result of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the 1968 amendments to the Act.

In the fall of 1970, Governor Cahill requested the Department of Education to prepare a broad-based vocational educational program for implementation in New Jersey schools, placing emphasis on the elementary and middle school years. The Division of Vocational Education was asked to implement the career education procedures that it was hoped would represent a positive and measurable influence on the youth of New Jersey through: decreasing the dropout rate; increasing enrollment in vocational education courses; increasing placement in jobs and/or continuing education; and improving school attendance and performance. The Governor recommended that three cities, Camden, New Brunswick, and Rahway, be considered as sites for model career development programs.

On October 19, 1970, the enabling legislation containing an appropriation of $318,000 of state funds was unanimously passed in both Houses of the State Legislature. The official purpose of this legislation was sketched in the statement attached to the bill.

The career development program emphasizes a new approach combining technical activity and academic classroom lessons designed to provide awareness of vocational opportunities. This new approach to learning for all students will include the following vocational education elements in the school districts:

First, technology for children. This phase, extending through the first six grades of school, provides an educational atmosphere in which children accept work as necessary in the vital segment of human endeavor. It combines technical activities and academic classroom lessons to help children develop a better understanding of themselves and of technology.

Second, introduction of vocation. This phase of the program provides broad basic occupational exploration, including manipulative classroom, shop, laboratory, and a few other experiences in a variety of occupational areas. It is designed to assist young people in the middle school through junior high school to develop a more realistic plan for their careers.

Third, coupled pre-vocational work study. This phase of the program offers open vocational academic classroom during summer months, study, and a variety of pre-vocational experience, combined with natural work experience in the public sector.

Fourth, job placement. This phase of the program is designed to fulfill the obligation of education by providing placement opportunities for all students, particularly for most of those employment-bound directly from high school.

Fifth, career resource center. Career resource centers will be established in each of the pilot school districts to provide to both teachers and schools a wide variety of instructional materials and media relating to occupations of all kinds.

And **sixth,** in-service teacher training. Teachers currently teaching at the elementary, junior, middle, and senior high school levels receive in-service training to prepare them for the career development projects.

These program elements remain as the key features of the career development program to this day. State funds in the same amount were authorized for the fiscal year 1972 to continue these three model programs.

However, in fiscal year 1973, additional state funds in the amount of $747,000 were appropriated to expand the program to three additional cities. At this moment, Governor Cahill has requested in his annual budget request to the legislature that the funding be increased to $1.7 million, so that ten additional cities can begin implementation.

Funding under the program requires a commitment on the part of local districts to at least match, if not exceed, the fixed amount made available for the program. It was understood from the outset that the initial amount would be gradually reduced and that the local district is expected to increase its share for the program until it becomes self-sustaining.

I have been talking principally about the Governor's career development program. For many districts of the State of New Jersey, we have been using local funds to fund one or more elements that I described previously. The first three cities identified under the career development program have already made substantial commitments to vocational programs with local funds and were selected primarily because of the local commitment to vocational education.

Some cities have been identified primarily because they are urban centers. The cities are advised to submit proposals requesting funds of no more than $65,000. Submission of such a proposal would carry with it a statement that $100,000 will also be appropriated from local funds thus making a total of $165,000 available to implement the program previously mentioned.

As of 1965, the years of experience in career development have provided more than enough information to make us confident that this funding level is realistic and effectual in its initiation of career education in the State of New Jersey.

In conclusion, let me say that we firmly believe that the State of New Jersey is on the right course and that we will have the necessary self-sustaining power.

Ms. Mary Aravale

The third formal presentation was by Mary Aravale, member of the Career Education Task Force of the California Department of State. Her address follows:

Our sources of funding are Parts C and D of the Vocational Education Act, U.S. Office of Education funds.

Under Part C, P.L. 90-576, we were funded for $705,000 in research and development money. We split this on the first go-round, and in the second phase, hope to add two more sites to the program. The career model, as received by our task force, was to try for a selection of sites that would represent all of the elements we were looking for. The sites are various: an urban area, a rural area, one with an affluent population, one with a low-income population, and other sites that have a quite heavy concentration of Black people.

As a task force, we are trying to provide support to the local districts so that they will experiment and find the manner in which those students can be best helped.

In the first round of sites, we did not have a proposal. Therefore, in the second phase, we asked all the Model City sites in California to submit a proposal. Ten of the eleven did, including one with 98 percent Black disadvantaged population. We are looking forward to what is going to happen in that site.

Under Part D, funds were received in the amount of $330,000 per year for a period of three years. With this money we funded two projects. The State Department controlled Part D funds and built up the amount to a funding of $200,000 a year for each site. There are a variety of other C and D projects going on in California that are completely independent of our working task force.

Career education in California got an early start over three years ago. Several counties were funded to start education projects. Their money was $60,000, usable at the state's discretion, for research and development under Part C. Seventy-five thousand dollars was used from EDPA funds for teacher in-service training. At the present time, the state is coming up with many different types of action, also in the formative stages. We hope that all of the specialized education programs can focus on the career education concept. The people are concerned and all the departments are working individually to try and do this in their own programs.

We have also looked ahead to the prospect of no federal funds. Many districts are working completely independently, without any outside funding whatsoever. I have worked with three of those districts and they have a very good thing happening.

In California, we have many problems, but we have also had some successes. A big step lies between saying and doing, and we have taken that step.

Mr. Jack Jennings

The next speaker was Jack Jennings, counsel to the General Subcommittee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives. His remarks:

First, I would like to wish Mr. Pierce good luck in his job. He has a very difficult task ahead in the Administration. But I take issue with his statements about what the federal government is doing in career education.

Mr. Pierce presented a very good lawyer's brief on what they are doing, but I honestly cannot believe that everything in that paper is necessarily true.

I can't believe that all of the funds that were mentioned for career education are really being used for career education. Now there might be re-labeled programs and some components that have been interjected. But, I don't think there is really that much money being used by this Administration.

But even assuming that there was, even assuming that the figure of $114 million for this year and $140 million for next year is accurate, that is still only three percent of the entire budget of the Office of Education, and it's only two-thirds of one percent of the entire money spent on elementary and secondary education in this country.

As John Mitchell said, speaking in context of civil rights in the United States, we have to look to the Administration for what it does rather than what it says.

You cannot listen to what the spokesmen for the Administration, such as Sid Marland, have been saying about career education and find that they have backed it up with any money. It's a matter of a lot of rhetoric, such as, "You people ought to change the way you are doing things, but we are not going to give you any money to do it."

Now there is some merit to that. There is some merit to saying that the federal government has limited resources and that it cannot spread its resources to sustain the entire education system. But you cannot very well expect the City of Chicago, for example, to put more into such a project, when it is already $70 million in debt. They would have to shift into a new program without any new money. They cannot even keep their doors open right now. And in some other urban centers you cannot tell them that they have to shift their money and change their entire curriculum when they don't have that much money.

I would like to review what I understand to be the budgetary situation for this Administration. I don't really understand the budget because, unfortunately, they change the wording of the budget every year, so that you cannot really follow what they say. They don't always put in the budget exactly what they are going to do with everything.

But from what I understand, this Administration is asking that, in the present fiscal year, $14 million (which it had requested last year to be spent during this school year for the implementation of career education models throughout the country) will not be spent.

The Administration is saying that, even though nine months ago we said we wanted to spend $14 million to implement what we have been working on for a couple of years, we now don't want to spend that.

It also said that it does not want to spend $2 million that it had requested itself last year for curriculum revision for vocational education, so that is a cut of $16 million right there.

Now, as regards the school budget for the next fiscal year, as I understand it, the Administration has requested nothing for the Occupational Education Act. This Act was passed on a broad bipartisan basis by Congress. (There is very little dissension in Congress when you come to vocational education and career education. There is a legitimate, uniform feeling that the education system has to become more aware of the job market and what happens to children after they leave school.) Hopefully, the funds provided under the Act, some $10 or $20 million, would be used by the states for two purposes, one of which was career education in elementary and secondary schools.

This Administration didn't ask for any money for that Act. Now, if the Administration really believes that local officials had better judgment (which they are saying under revenue sharing) and if they really believe that career education is worth something, why didn't they ask for money for the Occupational Education Act?

That would give money to the state officials and to local officials for career education and turn the education systems around.

Vocational education is considered a component of career education. Again, I cannot understand the Administration's budget, but it seems that in this new thing called "special revenue sharing," which the President is pushing for education, vocational education would be consolidated in the bill with four other major subject areas of federal support. However, from the Office of Management and Budget documents I have seen, there would be $100 million less money spent on vocational education under that scheme than there is this year. And as I understand it from OMB documents, the $100 million comes from two new programs that were put in by Congress in 1968 and that have been some of the most successful programs in vocational education, programs for the disadvantaged and the economically and socially disadvantaged (whatever you want to call poor people) and also for the handicapped.

In 1968, Congress decided that vocational education had ignored these two areas for 50 years, so they required that each state use a certain amount of money for these two areas. As I understand it, we haven't seen the Administration's bills yet, but, the budget documents indicate that these amounts of money would be shifted away from vocational education and put into other categories, so that teachers of the handicapped could use them for their own means, not necessarily for vocational education or any career education for the handicapped. People who deal with disadvantaged children can shift the funds to anything they want to, not necessarily for vocational education and career education. This doesn't seem to me like much of a commitment by this Administration to career education.

My last point has to do with the form of the Education Revenue Sharing Bill itself. If the Administration doesn't change its bill, if it keeps the same format it had last year, it allows any state throughout the country to shift up to a third of the money from one category to another. In other words, a state can shift one-third of its vocational money into services for the handicapped, or for buying library books or equipment, or into disadvantaged services.

If this is so, not only would states lose $100 million that was set aside for vocational education, the disadvantaged in ghettos or poor rural areas, and vocational education for the handicapped, but there is a possibility that, depending upon the caprice of the state officials, the strength of audio-visual companies, or particular lobbies at the state level, up to one-third of the money that Congress said had to be spent in that program could be shifted out of vocational education and put into another area.

That's the basic effect of educational revenue sharing. If you really believe in Congress setting national priorities, if you really believe that Congress can look at the local picture and decide that there are certain things that have been neglected and have to be remedied, then you have to believe that federal legislation should reflect that and there should not be opportunities for people to shift money around without really telling you what they are going to do with it.

As citizens, you should be very concerned with what's happening with Congress and the President. Thirty years or forty years ago, when the New Deal came about, everybody thought Congress was a recalcitrant, obstructionist institution, which it was in many regards, and everybody glorified the concept of the power of the Presidency.

Well, that worked in its time, but we have a malfunction in our political system now. Not just this President, but a series of Presidents have said that the Presidency is such a strong institution that it can do what it wants with money that Congress has provided for particular programs. The Congress might as well go home if they lose this impoundment question, because it won't make a damn bit of difference how much money they provide, if the Administration decides not to spend it. They don't have much else to do, because the Administration can build up another bureaucracy and do about the same thing they are going to do the rest of their time.

Therefore, you should really be concerned with what's happening with the shift of federal control to the Presidency in this country.

Although Congress is not always the most responsive institution and many people in it represent small constituencies that don't really reflect your constituencies, this government was set up as a divided government intentionally so that power centers would counterbalance power centers. We do not have that now.

As citizens, you should think about that and support some measure to correct it.

Dr. Robert Reischauer

The final presentation was by Dr. Robert Reischauer of the Brookings Institution. His remarks:

I am going to give you a very short and a very pessimistic appraisal of future funding possibilities for career education, reiterating many of the points that Jack Jennings has made.

The way I look at the situation, there are really three potential possible sources for funding for career education, but none of them are very probable.

The first possibility is a direct funding of new programs by the Federal government. This would have been the approach taken in the 1960's and is what a lot of us were expecting when the Commissioner of Education first began talking about career education.

However, it is very clear from the new budget message released at the beginning of this week that such a program would go very much against the emerging philosophy of the Nixon Administration, which is the cutback on existing programs to stop all expansion in new categorical type of programs and limiting the federal government's role to research, demonstration, innovation, and reform.

We have just been told by the representative of the federal government that career education really isn't a *program*: it is a *concept* of how education should be structured. Therefore, no program is needed.

Now, I might agree with this, but it is clear that, historically, to get people to accept a new concept, you have to bribe them. The price of the bribe would have to be fairly high, I think, to get the states to accept this.

Right now, the federal government spends about half a billion dollars to get the states to spend $2 billion on vocational education. Career education supposedly is a larger, broader concept than vocational education. Therefore, we can assume it will cost more than $2 billion to implement to get it under way in any sort of rational way.

Is this $110 million a sufficient "bribe" to get this started, or is it just something that's keeping a bureaucracy in Washington going with something to do and a new innovation in a new way? In other words, I don't see the federal government providing money for career education or for a bribe.

The second way of funding career education is to raid the existing vocational education money. There are two problems with this approach, both of which were already pointed out.

The first problem is that the total amount devoted to vocational education is going to slip in the next few years. When you read through all the fine print of the budget, it is clear that it is going down about $100 million. It is going to the handicapped and the disadvantaged programs, and it is also going to go down just because existing vocational education programs are being reduced.

Another difficulty is that over 90 percent of the money devoted to vocational education will be in special revenue-sharing, which is going to have several problems. For instance, you can shift the money back and forth out of the vocational earmark and into some other category, for the handicapped or the disadvantaged.

In most states, the vocational education or career education lobbies will be working within other lobbies. This is especially true of any of the equalization suits surrounding the type of funding suits that will come through. Then it will be very clear that states will want to use as much money as they can, federal or state, for equalization. They will probably take 30 percent out of all of these programs.

So I do not see special revenue-sharing really as a source of money. However, you shouldn't look too critically on the special revenue-sharing effort if you believe that career education is really a reaction to the failures of vocational education to serve minorities in the right way or to provide a real career development program. Then the movement in the special revenue-sharing direction is good, because it will release Governors and in-state education departments from the restrictions now placed on vocational money. You will be able to use this money for all the broad types of programs that have come forth under the career education initiatives. There will be a little good along with the bad.

The third and last possible source of career education funding that I see is the state government itself. Fiscal pressures of the last decade are clearly easing, very rapidly. State and local governments are now running at a surplus. They will never tell you this, but aggregate statistics collected by the government reveal it. They are going to get general revenue-sharing money, which will help the situation even more. The federal government will take on the costs of the adult welfare programs in the next two years, with the exception of the Aid to Dependent Children Program.

So the overall fiscal pressure on states should ease, particularly education budgets, because the number of public school children will begin to drop in most states of the union.

This might allow people interested in education to look around for new and better ways of doing what they have done before. Maybe they will settle on career education.

Unfortunately, it is far from clear, at least from my standpoint, what career education even is. And if it is unclear to me, reading this voluminous literature down here in Washington, it is probably less clear in a lot of state capitals. This might imply that pressure groups will arise within states to try and snag some of the state surpluses and that other state demands will seem more pressing.

We have heard officials from both New Jersey and California tell about interesting experiments, pilot programs, task forces, and small initiatives in their state, but this is a long, long, long way from major funding of a new way of going about elementary and secondary education in the United States. We can congratulate them for the first steps they have made, but we should not think that this means that the states will pick up the tab, pick up the initiative, and run with the ball.

So, basically, I do not see any major funding for career education.

Questions and Answers

A question and answer session followed.

Question: I would like Dr. Pierce to explain how he is going to influence the use of funds for career education, now that the context for distributing the funds is going to revenue sharing?
Answer (Dr. Pierce): One thing has to be borne in mind, that for all intents and purposes, vocational education and many other educational programs for a number of years have been in a revenue-sharing mode. The funds for vocational education have been administered by the Office of Education. The majority of those funds have gone through state grants directed to the states without a great deal of influence possible at the federal level, except to see that the funds are used in the ways prescribed by the Congress.

Under revenue sharing, as it is now perceived in terms of vocational education and in terms of many of the other programs going into revenue sharing, the discretionary programs are not being transferred to revenue sharing and not being transferred to the states, so they stay with the federal government. The discretionary funds can still be used by Assistant Secretary Marland and Commissioner Ottina to carry out the same kind of thrust that has been carried out over the last couple of years.

The only thing we have to remember, those of you who have talked about the sparsity of funding in career education, is that this is a very new concept. We are very young—it's only been going on for 26 months—and I am not sure how much one can expect to happen over a 26-month period. But it is being influenced in the states and the states are indeed putting money into it. I come from a state where we did put money in career education as a result of the catalytic nature of federal funds.
Question: To clarify the previous question, now that you have funds, a decision will have to be made about distributing those funds. What will be your criteria for assigning those funds without release through revenue sharing?
Answer (Dr. Pierce): The criteria is, wherever possible, any discretionary funds will be used to support the career education concept. That is one of the major priorities in the Office of Education, but obviously not all of the funds can be used for specific programs in career education. There are other interests, other needs. As Shirley Chisholm pointed out today, a lot of adults will never be touched by the career education concept. It must be dealt with and the discretionary funds have to be addressed to those people as well. The criteria won't change, as I view it.
Question: Does the New Jersey career education emphasis on funding policies include the adult and

senior citizen population, which substantially affects the societal structure in New Jersey? If those people are not included, what is the rationale for their exclusion? Do you see the national career education emphasis and funding policies by-passing these same populations, and if so, would you recommend their inclusion? And finally, does New Jersey have a multi-ethnic body from the private and public sector advising on career education funding priorities?

Answer (Mr. Arents): Our Department of Education and Department of Higher Education were separated in 1967, and so we have administrative problems in trying to direct programs of any continuity. The funds that I mentioned were for kindergarten through 12th grade. A dialogue is going on between the two departments to address the populations you are talking about, but no money has been made available to any programs beyond Grade 12. Whether we will get any kind of breakthrough on federal funds for programs beyond the 12th grade will be dependent upon the decisions that are made about funding career education. Some of these decisions are resting in the courts of this country.

With respect to the multi-ethnic nature of the groups doing the advising, I could say yes to your question. The task forces are representative. The attempt has been made in New Jersey to involve many different groups in the planning of career education and the funding of the programs.

Question: Does your government and administration see the need to include adult population in career education? Even though you might not have authorization at the present time to spend dollars for adults, do you recommend that direction?

Answer (Mr. Arents): I just spent three years directing a program on adult education aimed at employment at the state level. We are involving people at the state and local levels from adult education in several plans for career education.

The definition (of career education) the task force developed does not stop at the grade level, but is a continuous line of education from the very young to the very old.

Question: The career education concept presupposes a full employment economy. What is being done to provide the opportunities the career education program is supposed to lead to? Is any kind of funding being done to provide occupational opportunities for the people you are preparing, or are we raising hopes upon which you can't deliver?

Answer (Dr. Pierce): Obviously, that has to be done. The employer-based model is one way you try to see just exactly how to involve business, industry, and labor with this whole business of career education. I talked with some business people the other night who wanted to get more involved, and I said, "Are you ready to guarantee jobs to youngsters who go through? These fellows suggested that that kind of society made them a little nervous. And I said, "What kind of society is that? It seems to me that it's only a society that makes promises to kids and then delivers what we promised them."

We are working on this at the moment, but for me to say that we have everything in place and smooth would be dishonest. This really relates to the question asked by Mr. Ashford earlier—can you fulfill the career education concept, but ignore all of the social problems? Obviously, you cannot. We are going to have to develop some strategies for job development as well as placement, because you simply cannot continue to make programs and not deliver. But how do you do that? Who is the agency responsible for that? Is it state, local, federal government? Is it industry?

Question: The record, as you well know, indicates that the people who need career education and vocational education—in fact, education—have been people who have not received the resources to get it. Only in the last seven or eight years has legislation made this possible. This has come about because of regulations in certain categories. Are we to be so naive as to believe that, if categorical regulations and restrictions are removed, the people who really need education are going to get a reasonable share of the resources?

Answer (Dr. Pierce): I can't imagine that anybody is talking about revenue sharing without any restrictions, just letting it flow without ever reporting back and without any accountability. So I am going to withhold my concern about revenue sharing, until I find out what really is detailed in those kinds of bills, what kind of restrictions and restraints are being attached to it as it goes to the states and the local levels.

Friday Morning Panel: Positions and Issues on Career Education

The Friday session opened with a panel on "Positions and Issues on Career Education," moderated by Dr. Lawrence Davenport, vice president of development at Tuskegee Institute. Reginald Petty presided over the session.

Six panelists representing minority caucuses and differing viewpoints presented brief summaries of position papers, most of which were published and distributed prior to the conference. The complete text of the papers by Dr. Brazziel, Dr. de los Santos, Mr. Venez, Dr. Shieh, and Mr. Dixon, appears also in A.L. Nellum and Associates' final report on the conference (Pt. I. Technical Operations), submitted to OE in March 1973.

Ms. Grace Uhara

Ms. Grace Uhara, the Japanese Caucus representative, was the first speaker.

On behalf of the Japanese Caucus, I want to express our appreciation for the opportunity to participate in this career education conference and to express some of our thoughts as representatives of our minority group.

We want this group to understand that Japanese Americans bear the scars of racism in our society; scars in many instances so deep that there are some of us unable to acknowledge and recognize them, which we must do if we are ever to be freed from them. As we listened yesterday, we had the wearying recognition of career education as an accepted fact. If it is an accepted fact, then certain changes in direction and priorities must be made.

Number one, educators at all levels, but mainly teachers and counselors, need retraining in order to become aware and sensitive to Asians.

As a school social worker in a suburban school district in Pennsylvania, I am deeply concerned with what we call the teacher in-service-stage, which represents an effort to retrain teachers. It is one opportunity to correct some of the misunderstandings that people have. One of the biggest problems of minority children is their poor self-image. Certainly if teachers and counselors, as first-hand contact people, are not able to understand and work to change this situation, education will remain a failure for a large segment of minority children.

While the National Education Association has set as one of its priorities for the 1970's the humanizing of the educational institution, it is only playing games if humanizing is limited to occasional in-service training.

In my experience in Pennsylvania with regard to federal programs such as Title I that affect the poor, I have yet to see minority leaders at the state decision-making level, and I'm hoping that this is not going to be the same thing with career education. But so far, I have not seen representative Asians at the decision-making level. Asians must be placed in decision-making roles at **all** levels. This step should be taken before any further decisions are made and funds allocated.

Curriculum development should have each of the minority groups serving in *all* advisory capacity. We wish to affirm also that each one of the Asian groups has a unique problem.

Finally, the concept of career education will never work until different government groups work more closely together to solve the many problems that continue in our society. And until our priorities are reset, we are wasting our time. Until we see the re-ordering of these priorities, I express for my group a lack of confidence in the present Administration. It is impossible to feel that there is a sincere desire to understand the problems, when we see the many cut-backs in important programs that have just happened, cutbacks that we feel affect the minoirty people disproportionately.

Dr. William F. Brazziel

Dr. William F. Brazziel, Professor of Higher Education at the University of Connecticut was the next speaker.

Career education can help Black Americans, of course, but there is much in the history of the performance of guidance counselors and vocational educators in charge of such programs to suggest that it will fail do to this, especially for poor youth. Let me apologize here to the thousands of counselors and vocational educators who have done yeoman's service in programs to help poor Black youth. But for every good practitioner in these ranks, there seems to be a counterpart somewhere who leaves much to be desired.

Career education may very well fail, too, because it does not fit the Black community's needs and thus can offer only tangential benefits. Further, career education runs counter in many aspects to the drive to add to the ranks of Black college-trained professionals.

Black Americans made impressive advances in education in the past decade, and the trend is still upward. The percentage of Black young adults with a high school diploma jumped from 36 to 62. Black college student enrollment almost doubled. It is projected by the Labor Department that 80 percent of young Black adults will hold a high school diploma by 1980; college-enrolled Blacks by 1980 should comprise about 10 to 12 percent of the total. Career education could very well turn back the clock on these gains, and we want to make sure that this does not happen.

Career educators should study carefully the need for Black professionals and move toward getting these people trained. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education has developed a fine chart on the need for additional black students in medical, dental, law, and graduate schools. In the new scheme of things, the 28,000 Blacks now enrolled would be increased by a factor of three. More importantly, Black graduate scholarships would total some $326 million. Blacks don't go to graduate and professional school now, because they don't have any money to go.

Now here is a simple obtainable objective with a clear price tag. Can career education mobilize to reach this objective? Or is it beyond the program's scope and competence? If career education cannot deliver here, if it is unable to get high-level people trained, can it ever have legitimacy in the Black community? I think not.

Career education must also grapple with a multitude of school practices that are counterproductive to the full development of Black talent. The poor Black child's "career education" (and I use that in quotes) begins today when he arrives in the first grade. Here, he is administered some inaccurate tests and the message is conveyed to him and his future teachers that as a result of his poor performance on these tests, he is never going to amount to very much in this world. The National Education Association has called for a moratorium on this deplorable situation. Will career education join in this concern and take action?

If poor Black children make it through the elementary grades with few undue scars, can career education help out when the real scarring begins in the high schools? Will poor, bright, Black youth be exposed to the summer jobs in business and government so necessary for their horizons to be raised? Or will they still be shunted into weed-pulling jobs? Or no jobs?

Will poor, bright, Black youth be invited into the college preparatory planning sessions? Will they systematically learn of the opportunities for college scholarships and grants early in their high school years? Will they be referred to white as well Black college recruiters, or is this program just another federal rain dance?

Then there is the problem of job discrimination in the real world of work. There were more per capita building trades craftsmen in the Black community during the slavery years than exist there now. Many forces are at work to try to bring about a better situation. Will career education lend a hand and use its influence to place Black youth in apprenticeship programs and on the jobs in the construction trades?

I hope the answer to all of these questions is *yes*. Career education is something that is going to happen, it seems, and the only choice of Blacks at this point is to try to shape it to the very best advantage possible for the youth involved.

Dr. Gilberto de los Santos

Dr. Gilberto de los Santos, president of the University of El Paso Community College was the next speaker.

There is an old saying in Spanish that, "A cat which has been burned with hot milk will blow at cottage cheese." This is my position with career education. We in the Chicano community have been burned by hot milk, not only through vocational education, but the whole of the educational system, so we wish to blow on the cottage cheese—career education—before we partake of it.

This morning I want to talk to you about four things as I see them as a Chicano educator. I want to discuss: (1) testing, counseling, and decision-making; (2) curriculum development and articulation; (3) professional education; and (4) what I call the internalizing for institutionalization.

I am not saying that I, as an interested Chicano educator, do not accept the concept of career education. I have been involved in the community/junior college movement all my professional life and I have been working to develop curricular patterns and educational systems that incorporate most of the ideas upon which career education is based, not in the so-called academic field, but certainly in the vocational/technical/occupational field.

Many of us in the community/junior college movement have worked to provide adequate counseling to students so they can be knowledgable about career options. We have worked to provide flexible entrance and exit requirements, so students could drop in and out of the educational experience at any time. We have worked to develop career ladders and career lattices, so that a student need not have a "permanent bondage to a career goal," to quote Marland, but can move up or sideways whenever he feels the need.

It is not the concept of career education about which I have questions; it is with the implementation of the concept that I am concerned. It is with the many, many safeguards that need to be taken to insure that Chicanos receive from the educational system the benefits they deserve.

The many possible sins of omission and commission could do more harm to our children than has been done to date. These are some of these questions that I hope to discuss in this paper, particularly as they relate to the problems of the institution in not being able to serve the needs of the Chicanos in higher education, beginning with pre-admission counseling, through upward mobility, and job placement.

In the past, Chicanos in high schools have been counseled into rather meaningless vocational/technical programs that have prepared them for something less than meaningful jobs. Decisions have been made by counselors and educators on the basis of invalid, unreliable testing instruments that really do not measure aptitude, potential, or whatever needs to be measured. What safeguards will be taken by the proponents of career education to attempt to prevent this from happening again?

Attempts by minority leaders to scrap these testing programs—at least to prevent them from being used to counsel minority students "out" or "away from" programs—have proven fruitless. It would seem to be that the Office of Education must take strong steps to see that entrance and exit requirements will be flexible enough to enable all persons to acquire, at any time they choose, the educational and occupational experiences that meet their needs.

Another related problem of career counseling is that the vast majority of the counselors not only do not understand the culture of the Chicano student, but in many instances do not care to learn. Part of the re-orientation of counselors should include training that would increase awareness, understanding, and appreciation for the different sets of values the Chicano students hold, the culture and mores of the students, and how these relate to their outlook toward life.

What is much more important—and I have seen nothing about this in any of the literature, and heard nothing outside of this conference—is the need to train or educate Chicanos to serve in professional positions in order to better serve Chicano students' needs—from counselors, through teachers, through administrators.

However, the few funds that have been available to train people for positions in higher education, under Part E of the Education Professions Development Act, have been drastically reduced. There were $5.8 million in fiscal 1973, and that has been reduced to $2.1 million in 1974. Nothing is planned after that. This was for fellowship programs. They have cut out the institute part of the program, too.

I really do not believe the Administration can be talking of such drastic educational reform as implied in the career education concept and be really serious about including the minorities, if plans are not developed to provide funds to educate or train Chicano minorities.

It seems to be that the whole of education has done a lousy job of training the people who are currently entrenched in the system about our culture and our needs. We are just beginning, I think, to make some inroads, but they have already changed the name of the game of the career education model, so that very few people in the field really understand.

The concept of career education, on paper, is a good concept. I like it. However, I've seen "in" words and slogans that become passwords to federal funds develop into programs that have done little or nothing for the Chicano community. In fact, some programs have done irreparable harm.

So, just like that cat would want to blow at the cottage cheese after he was burned with hot milk, I want to blow on career education. I like the concept, but I am very cautious about the implementation of it.

Mr. Ramon S. Velez

Ramon S. Velez, president Hunts Point Multi-Service Center, Inc., was the fourth speaker. His topic was "Is Career Education the Answer to the Educational and Vocational needs of the Puerto Rican New Yorker?"

The evidence is clear that the quality of education in New York City varies. To the Puerto Rican child, it means academic failure. New approaches are past due.

The majority of the 250,000 Puerto Rican children presently attending school in the City of New York find themselves confined to an educational limbo. As they move from the elementary to the secondary education system, they receive neither sufficient preparation for college nor sufficient vocational education and/or training.

Is it any wonder that the dropout rate is higher than for any other group? Fifty-three percent of all

Puerto Rican students drop out once they reach the tenth grade in academic schools and few of those remaining are enrolled in college-bound courses.

The Puerto Rican New Yorker has a median age of 19 years, the youngest ethnic group in the City. He has the lowest median income—around $5,500 for a family of four—and thus the greatest need for welfare assistance.

Is career education the answer to the Puerto Rican New Yorker, the students and community-at-large trapped in either an educational or an economic wasteland? There is no ready answer.

If the concept of career education is to express its proper meaning instead of being another euphemism, if it is to inspire credibility instead of mistrust, and if it is to become a remedy instead of a palliative, the concept must be assessed by Puerto Ricans within the context of their lives as a minority in a class-oriented and unequal society.

The failure of the schools to provide the ways to meet the needs and special problems of students who are educationally affected by poverty, language, and cultural barriers is in no way different from the failure of the society at large to set up relevant programs to minimize the disparity of opportunities in the job market for the poor or non-white.

We know that the educational structure is no less rigid than that of industry, unions, and credential-oriented professions. We know how governmental priorities, even when sensibly articulated, are not always backed up with financial allocations with which to make implementation of stated goals a feasible reality.

As a minority representative, I prefer to remain an optimist. Yet my optimism must not be devoid of a healthy sprinkling of skepticism when confronted with new concepts, such as that of career education, until such time as the tools to back up the concept are presented in a palpable, comprehensive, and tenable manner.

In my functions as president of the Hunts Point Multi-Service Center in the Bronx, I have worked for several years in close participation with the teachers, counselors and administrative personnel of the school districts. Two years ago, we implemented at the school/community level a modest element of what career education could be. In cooperation with the school officials, the Hunts Point Multi-Service Health Center sponsored a "Health Careers Week" program in one of the junior high schools. In the library of the school, we set up a week-long exhibition of visual aids, literature, and material related to health careers, both at a professional and paraprofessional level.

The exhibitions were manned by representatives of the various health disciplines such as doctors, nurses, nutritionists, social workers, community health workers, laboratory technicians, psychologists, psychiatrists, dentists, dental assistants, etc. Each morning and afternoon during assembly period, one or more of the health disciplinarians addressed the assembled students in a give-and-take exchange of information and inquiry concerning the how, why, when, where, who, and outcome of becoming a particular health service provider. During the course of the day, the students came to the library to collect material and to discuss their interests with the Health Center staff.

As the next step, the principals or counselors assigned a group of students to spend two days per week for a two-month period in our Health Center. Each student was assigned to the health provider of his choice. The importance of remaining in school until graduation and choosing high school courses leading to the career of their liking was stressed throughout the duration of the program.

When the program ended, the school principal wrote us:

> A significant rise in the aspiration level of our children was evident by the large number of valid questions the guidance department has received . . . concerning health careers and high school placement. I hope that this is just the beginning of a mutually beneficial involvement between our school and your organization.

In the training of community people in health careers, the Hunts Point Multi-Service Center has also made great strides to implement career education goals. We have hired and successfully trained community people to become medics, dental assistants, ambulance attendents, community mental health workers, day-care aides, teacher assistants, social health workers, record room clerks, outreach and community organizers, educational health aides, etc. Many of these trainees have gone on to college or further training leading to licensure.

It is, therefore, by reasons of experience and philosophy that we believe in the concept of career education. We further believe that whenever an on-going educational structure fails to reach the academic needs of a large proportion of its students, new approaches to education must be considered.

It is right and proper that conferences such as this be held to discuss and clarify the many issues involved in career education, especially as it affects minority groups.

Dr. Francis Shieh

The fifth presentation was given by Dr. Francis Shieh, professor and chairman, Department of Economics, Prince Georges Community College.

My dear fellow taxpayers, we are here to try to get some rebates perhaps. This is wealthy nation, naturally, but it is not a nation of diamonds only; it's a nation of other treasure stones, be it black or tiger's eye or cat's eye, so in that kind of concept, perhaps you see a nation of all colors. We are a very colorful and a very interesting nation.

My paper is about a community college because I am an educator in a community college. During the past four decades, there has been a drastic change in the education prerequisites for individuals to participate in a chosen career. The Department of Labor and the Center for Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan report states:

> In the 1930's, more than half of the nation's job requirements were elementary education or less, about 30 percent required a college degree. However, by 1970 only 6 percent of the jobs required elementary education; 26 percent required high school education, but 50 percent required the equivalent of an Associate Degree granted by a community college; 18 percent required Bachelor's or higher degree.

A most significant aspect of this is that, in 1930 the Associate Degree was not even recognized and yet, in 1970, it is required to fill half of the jobs in the market. The new age of technology has made this requirement compulsory, and in answer to the need, the growth of the two-year college has been most significant.

There can be no doubt that as a source of manpower development and training, community colleges have become highly significant to industry, not only because we are attempting to meet the demand for post-secondary education, but simply because of the number of students we are producing for the job market.

Various elements have pointed out that the basic goal of the community college is to give knowledge and skill to students not seeking a college degree, or to provide career-oriented preparation to serve both the needs of students and the community by meeting employment requirements beyond the traditional high school level of education.

I wish to cite a statement made by former Commissioner of Vocations, Office of Education, Grant Venn:

> . . . . . unless far more and better education on the semi-professional, technical, and skilled level is soon made available to greater numbers of citizens [meaning the minorities and minority of the minorities] the national economy and social structure will suffer irreparable damage.

The general lack of entrance standards can encourage students to explore the possibility of continuing education, particularly minority students who have had no post-secondary education or who have been away from formal education for some time. This may be particularly important, when we consider that the average member of a minority group will change his type of employment three or four times or more during the course of his working life. Community colleges do have the opportunity to offer help in exploring new fields or upgrading present ones.

There is a place for the minorities in the technical programs of career education in the community colleges, and community colleges must strive for quality and equal opportunity for all Americans and all minorities. These, I am convinced, are top priorities on the agenda of our nation, and this theme, I believe, is the very essence of our conference.

Mr. Joseph Dixon

Joseph Dixon (standing in for Roy Innis) of the Congress of Racial Equality followed with a summary of his paper entitled "Career Education: From Whence It Came, Whither It Goeth."

First of all, we define the purpose of education as follows: "Education as a process is the means by which human beings are changed from what they are to what they may become." It is obvious, therefore, that there are as many types of education as there are ways living. There can be good education and there can be bad education, just as there is a good life and a bad life. Thus, for Black Americans, the desirability of any type of education may be measured by the relationship of its aims and procedures to them as a people. This suggests the question: what benefit will Black Americans gain and how will these gains be achieved?

In order that we may intelligently postulate the questions raised in connection with the proposed career education approach to education, Black Americans must, before giving their stamp of approval, recognize that no evaluation is creditable unless placed in a historical perspective.

Let me stop to think just for the moment about some of the ways that the educational system of American has profoundly affected us by its reaction and results. It perpetuated eradication of the natural American, that is, the Indian. It did, in fact, perpetuate the inferior characterization of Orientals, Spaniards, and others who happen not to be white.

So then, we look at prophetic visions as expounded by S.P. Marland, Jr.:

> "Career education is a way to provide career awareness in the early grades and career preparation in the upper grades that continues at an ever increasing level of sophistication until every student is equipped to enter the occupation of his choice . . . limited only by his personal ability."

History shows that such statements are, by and large, made with the exclusivity of Blacks in mind. While we should not be critical of any concept of education that is directed in earnest toward the fundamental goal of a better life for more people, we must be prepared to answer the following questions:

- Do Blacks, in fact, have an education problem peculiar unto Blacks; if so, let's define the nature of the problem.

- Is the Black education problem brought about because of the failure of Blacks to maximize their potential or because of massive societal manipulation and ostracism?

- What guarantees are incorporated in the career education approach that ensure a shift in institutional power to guarantee a positive response to the education needs of Black Americans?

While pondering the questions raised, it is essential that we reflect on the power of present institutions to restrain, block, or direct "good and bad" outcomes within the societal structure. Also, it is important that we recognize that changes in the American power structure and educational direction have generally come about as a result of shifts in the political and economic order of society.

The very fact that President Nixon in his 1972 State of the Union Address, cited and stressed the need for a new direction in the American educational process, is sufficient reason for one to believe that a change is actually in the making. Mr. Nixon stated that: "We need a new approach, and I believe the best new approach is to strengthen career education."

The statement is quite significant. However, Blacks must not view any such effort as the panacea that will bring a Utopian educational system. We must insist, without retraction, that the changing system be designed so as to provide for our growth as a people. Care must be taken to guard against the practices of suboptimization, which fill our past history and serve as the major cause for the psychological chaos Blacks have experienced over the Fifties and the Sixties.

Mr. Marland has stated that, "Career education favors no ethnic group to the exclusion of any other." However, it is significant to us as Blacks that the fundamental models Mr. Marland has presented do, in fact, bring into focus a very interesting shift and a warning to Blacks: namely, one model deals exclusively with the rural disadvantaged, known to be more than 80 percent white. Further, no such effort is directed towards the peculiar needs of the urban Black population.

This is clearly a shift that needs to be assessed on the basis of the overall and, as yet, undefined objectives of the career education approach. However, the essence of career education as pronounced by those who have input in its development appears to be the systematic education of the individual toward a productive life through provision of the essentials—both intellectual and practical—required to sustain and perpetuate the growth of the society.

Another significant point we must raise is, who will manage career education? Many Black people frankly don't want to judge the correctness or the significance of their actions by long-term standards. Instead, our standard is based on what gives us the greatest, immediate advantage. With this in mind, we must come to understand this great leadership consists of devising long-range objectives that may require a limitation of our immediate advantage.

Hence, before proclaiming the concept of career education as the solution to the Black American's problems, we must look deep into our present educational concepts to determine the cause for their failure, giving specific concern as to how this failure relates to young Blacks.

Upon doing so, one is sure to find that, while our social, political, and economic societies are built on principles of fair dealing, the actual workings are often complete perversions of those principles.

Students are taught that the voters elect government officials, and that those officials, when elected, are subject to certain checks and balances; they aren't actually taught how political bosses contrive to control the votes and how often, with the aid of the most respectable citizens in town, they completely circumvent the checks and balances.

Nor are they taught how this situation tends to decrease the country's possible income. They may be taught laws that govern business functions, but they are not taught how some men conspire to defeat the purpose of these laws.

Above all, the student is not made to see that, from the day he steps into his first job, he will be faced with situations in which opportunities for advancement will conflict with the theory that every American boy can become President of the United States. In fact, the average young person, Black, white, or any color, emerging from school or college finds a world about which he was never taught or psychologically prepared for. This is the basis for the failure of the present educational thrust.

Career education concept as proposed must be managed from the top in conjunction with the projected skill needs of the various local areas and the nation as a whole. And it would be folly to think that the people at the top who hold both economic and political power would hesitate to issue directives on the careers the rising generations should adopt.

Herein lies the real danger for the Black American, for unless he is involved at the highest level and engaged in the task of selecting, influencing, and managing the career areas as trends develop, we may be certain that no significant change will come about relative to our socioeconomic plight. Thus, our education problems will be perpetuated.

Should Blacks accept the proposition of career education as having merit, they should examine whether: (1) the planners will structure the working models of career education to trace and correct the historical sequence of institutionalized racism that permeates the entirety of "operations" American; and (2) career education will aid Black people in achieving the control of resources in their community, thereby expanding opportunity, stability, and self-determination, and permitting them to make a maximum contribution economically, socially, and politically to the well-being of the nation.

In other words, Blacks must come to understand that the true cause for their strife-torn condition is deeply embedded in the American educational philosophy; and that philosophy has formed the attitudinal tendencies of white America, and as such, structured this society to be unresponsive to the needs of its Black population.

Therefore, unless the proposed career education concept is intended to enable the Black American to attain his maximum potential socially, economically, and politically, then we may be certain that it is nothing more than a re-affirmation of "white" nationalism that has prevailed throughout the history of America.

To offset any such suspicion, the following steps should be taken: (1) The establishment of a National Bureau of Black Education and Economic Affairs designed to promote the interests of and respond to the peculiar needs of Black citizenry; and (2) The establishment of a Black Community Economic Development Fund specifically designed to promote the development of Black business and industry within the confines of the various Black communities.

Ms. Ruth Corcoran

The following position paper by Indian Caucus Representative Ruth Corcoran, "Career Education: Monolithic—Never!" is included here in its entirety because of its omission from the published volume distributed at the conference.

Commissioner Marland has made the following statement concerning the goals of career education:

> Educators must be bent on preparing students either to become properly and usefully employed upon graduation from high school or to go on to further formal education. The student should be equipped occupationally, academically, and emotionally to spin off from the system at whatever point he choses—whether at age 16 as a craftsman apprentice, or age 30 as a surgeon, or age 60 as newly trained practical nurse.

Later, in *Career Education*, he states . . .

> There will not be "dropouts," only individuals who choose to go to work or to pursue a different kind of education. Entrance and exit requirements will be flexible enough to enable all persons to acquire—at any time they choose—the educational and occupational experiences that meet their needs.

Of course, there is more. Taken out of context, there is probably agreement that this is good. What concerns me is the "how" of this goal. Career education for the minority groups is not a monolithic concept. Much thought must be given many things to make the concept viable. This conference is one step in that direction.

To be meaningful, career education must be thought of as a tapestry—one composed of many threads, woven in many intricate designs. While minorities have much in common, they have many differences. These differences have been ignored, have been trampled on, have been misunderstood—sometimes by intention and often by ignorance.

Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, has written that neglected minorities must pull together. They must not fall into the trap in which each separate group grasps for its own small advantage, but they must learn to cooperate and to give full support to overall priority issues. Mr. Jordan referred to the revived interest in Black traditions, group values, and interests.

> This development is a positive and healthy sign of the strengths of our pluralistic society. It is the recognition of the healthy differences among us, and of the need to respect differences that add to the interest and diversity of a healthy society.

The cause of minorities has become a fashionable issue for individuals, government officials, and others. Vine Deloria has written of the Native American Indian . . .

> There appears to be some secret osmosis about Indian people by which they can magically and instantaneously communicate complete knowledge about themselves to these interested whites. Rarely is physical contact required. Anyone and everyone who knows an Indian or who is interested, immediately and thoroughly understands them.

In the past, the government found it fairly simple to determine what an Indian was and to determine his goals and way of life. The government decided the Indian must have exactly the same goals as the white establishment. But the white world became a nightmare for the Indian. Indian heritage is quite different from the white.

Indians of the United States have a common cultural base, but each tribe, each section of the Big Country, has its different problems. Therefore, within the Indian population, there are differences that must be considered and at the local level. Discrimination against Indians is more intense in some areas.

Paternalism dominates the attitude toward Indians, whether it be on the part of individuals, church, or government. These factions want to be of service but in their own (white) way. Native American Indians find it very difficult and most often impossible to have input with these factions. In many cases the Indian would like to be rid of them.

Native American Indians who live in the cities or suburbs have unique situations. Indians who live on reservations—far from cities—have other problems. Many of these people are proud of their heritage and relate to their "Indianness." These people want to preserve what land they have left and keep their culture. People as resources must be used wisely. Isaac Asimov, author of science fiction, believes "exposure to diversity, both cultural and genetic, is an absolute good, and will, in time to come, be an integral and essential part of education." This has begun to take place recently.

Compulsory schooling laws were initiated for the individual and community to help them economically, politically, socially, and militarily. There developed a system that segregated pupils by age and by the degree they measured on the academic scale. Those whose experiences and needs were different from the majority were often given a low rating. The "dropout" rate at the high school and college levels has proven that an alternative and more inclusive educational method must be forthcoming. This alternative could very well be the concept of career education.

It would be expected that colleges and graduate schools would be much like they now are in accommodating the interested and qualified. But admissions criteria would be revised and broadened. Testing would be different. Many considerations must be given. What are some of the specifics?

Regarding teachers: Children spend a good share of their day with teachers. Teachers should be required to take courses at the college level that deal with cultural sensitivity. When possible, teachers in training or as part of an in-service course should go out into the field and become involved with minority people.

Regarding cultural sensitivity: Special programs should be offered to the minorities pertaining to language, culture, and history. There is an increased sense of pride in Indian students in their heritage. This would help educate the non-Indian community. For example, what an effect it would have on Indian youth to know that many of the herbs used by the American Indian are used in medicine today. This could create an interest in pharmacology. Language classes in the local tribal language would produce a bi-lingual person. Bi-lingual persons often speak a third language and this could open the way to become an interpreter. This training could be phased in at the elementary level.

Regarding diversity: There should be surveys and studies within the schools and communities involved. In analyzing instruction for a minority, we must remember that minority impact and input is vitally needed. For example, guidance people must give the Indian student counseling and advice in career planning that has a relationship to his life style, goals, and aspirations. This might require an in-service program for the guidance counselor already in the schools. Minorities and Indian children have been tracked into manual arts without being given other academic or college preparatory programs. Many of these students were qualified for academic work. Counselors must work directly with the pupils, directly with the parents, and directly with the schools.

Regarding attitudes: The white educator approaches minorities with the expectation of failure or of inferiority. Therefore, the Indian student is educated in an environment which anticipates that he will not do well. Funds that have been designated for education of the disadvantaged groups or specifically for the Indian have been used for generally uplifting the school district. Sometimes these monies are lost in the total school budget. Specific funding must have its place in the budget and an accounting must be made of them. These attitudes must be rectified.

Regarding curriculum: The structuring of programs by educational institutions must be geared to the development of student needs. This allows a student to learn skills that he has not had a chance to establish. This course can be begun at an early educational level and will decrease the need at the higher levels of learning. It follows that opportunities for learning will increase.

Regarding advisory boards: It is recommended that there be a State Board of Education of Minorities with representatives from each group. Service time on the board should be limited. Members could be elected or appointed. One of the duties would be to keep the commissioner aware of the needs of the children. This board must understand local board policies and serve as liaison between their community and school. They must be familiar with budgeting and other policies. They must be aware of the trends in education, and this includes career education. There should be an active interest in all vocational and post-secondary education. The value of communication is tremendous.

Regarding community school councils: This type of council would give minority parents direct input into the programs. One of the prime duties of parents would be participating with the principal in setting up objectives for education programs and deciding with the principal how to evaluate the programs. Qualifications for council membership would be that the member be a parent, have educational know-how, live in the area, etc. A mechanism for resolving disputes might be a three-member committee, including representatives from the council and the school district plus mutually agreed-upon neutral party. A formal structure for involvement would help the parents communicate with school officials. No doubt many communities have this and could help implement the career education concept as a part of their duties.

There is much to be considered. There are many questions and of course, some disagreements. Disagreement suggests that there is input needed from other sources and perhaps the changing of other people's thoughts. This is good. It will make for improvement of the career education concept.

Questions and Answers

Following the panel on "Positions and Issues on Career Education," the panel members were joined by Dr. Marland, Mr. Muirhead, and Dr. Ottina for a question-and-answer session. Dr. Acosta served as the moderator.

(The editors have abbreviated and summarized some of the questions and answers to avoid printing the entire, lengthy transcript of the session.)

Question: I am presently involved in counselor education and more specifically in a training program to train minority counselors. We would like to know whether there is funding or whether you foresee funding to programs such as ours in the near future?

Answer (Dr. de los Santos): There is no money. I mentioned earlier that the only source of funds that I know of is the EPDA (Educational Professional Development Act) Fellowship Program, which provides a one- to two-year training program, or the EPDA Institutes, funded through Washington. There are some monies that go to the states, but I don't know how to play that game yet. I am going to have to go back and learn.

Question: Do the members of the panel and/or representatives of the Office of Education present see the establishment of multi-ethnic advisory committees to deal with policy making and fund allocation as viable to career education and protective of the non-dominant group's vested interests? Secondly, would the panelists support and make such a recommendation to the Office of Education?

Answer (Dr. Brazziel): If we don't have such a panel. I would suggest that we have one and, if we have such a panel, I surely would suggest that it be heavily laden with members from minority groups.

Dr. Marland: The short and abrupt answer to that question would be yes. The longer answer needs fur ther amplification. I think we have some 32 advisory panels in the Office of Education. We have several now emerging in the National Institute of Education.

There are presently so many advisory councils that they tend to overlap in terms of their objectives or constraints. So we are trying very hard to reduce the number of advisory councils, simply because we are not able to give them the respectful attention that they deserve at the top management level. I happen to believe very deeply in the concept of advisory councils and I believed that way before it became fashionable.

Right now, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Technical Education has assumed some of the initiative for guiding us on career education, but that tends to skew the matter, as though it were strictly vocational/technical. The National Council on Adult Education has also taken an interest in it. There you have an overlap.

Some of our higher education councils, including an accreditation council, have taken a keen interest in this subject. Certainly our new National Board for Educational Research will clearly have a large responsibility for giving direction to our research activities on this subject. In my judgment, we are going to have to clear the air before we can usefully create another council that would further duplicate mandates of existing councils.

It is meetings like this that will help us to clear our thoughts, and decide exactly what we can do that can be useful. In the long pull, I would see a separate, vigorous council consisting of a broad representation of all of the people in the United States.

Question: What about the possibility of establishing a committee of persons functioning informally, but in behalf of people?

Answer (Mr. Muirhead): We have and will continue to involve all sectors of the educational community and all sectors of the public in helping us to hammer out the concept of career education. Now, you have a very good example of it in the representative group forming your Steering Committee, and we intend to continue to consult with it.

There will be many other interests we will be contacting from time to time. This past year, we had a series of 16 nationwide meetings in which we tried to bring in all the interests of the public, industry, unions, and education. We haven't even begun to scratch the surface of reaching the whole area of classroom teachers; we haven't done nearly the job that we should have in involving post-secondary institutions, and until such time as we get all of those inputs, it seems to me to be a little premature for us to think of organizing a Career Education Advisory Council.

Question: Would new advisory councils go into operation before the program begins? If you are, are you going to consult businessmen, elementary school teachers, junior high schools, etc., before the program goes into effect?

Answer (Dr. Marland): The 16 seminars or institutes held throughout the country last spring were specifically designed to bring together teachers and administrators. These will continue. Universities are now coming into this picture. Deans of some 70 schools of education met earlier this winter in Columbus, to try to find ways that they can reach a broader network of teacher training institutions, instead of trying to do it individual by individual throughout the school system.

We are indeed engaging teachers. The Manpower Institute of Washington has been engaging the business community throughout the United States, and representatives of AFL-CIO are working very closely with us on this. We are trying to engage a great number of people. If we narrow it too quickly to soemthing that would be viewed as theoretically representative of all people in the 15-member council, I think it would be too early.

Question: But, sir, you you didn't answer my question. How are teachers too going to get some look at the kinds of things larger groups are saying, since this is a national project?

Answer (Dr. Marland): Now, each of the groups we have tried to bring together—industry, education, business, etc.—has its own network; for example, every chief state school officer in the United States, every state secretary of education, has endorsed this proposition and has correspondingly accepted his responsibilities at the state level to do what we are trying to do at the national level.

Obviously, this has to decentralize and get the multiplier effect from Washington to states, to localities, cutting across the sweep of teachers, business, labor, parents, and young people, whom I hold should be involved in this debate.

Question: Then the program is a *fait accompli*, and what we are doing here is really unnecessary?

Answer (Dr. Marland): No, the program is not a *fait accompli*, and again, that's why we are having this meeting—to set some of the goals and examine some of the theories. This is why we are trying to call it a concept, before it becomes a program. Maybe after another six months or a year, particularly after we have the benefits of research from a National Institute of Education and the results of the large debate, we will continue to stimulate, we will begin to make some definitions and focuses that can be examined by various groups.

Question: I have heard our Assistant Secretary on a number of occasions express his concern for what's happening to the poor and the disadvantaged. And I believe that his expressions have been sincere and genuine; yet we who are a part of the disadvantaged minorities know that over the last 95-100 years, education of the poor and especially the Blacks has not been what we would like for it to have been.

We have been more successful, I believe, in the last ten years, with more accomplishments and achievements than at any other period. Part of the reason has been new regulations that required changes at the local and state levels.

These regulations now appear to be vanishing in light of some of the proposed legislation and I want to say to the Secretary that there are those of us who are anxious because of what's proposed. That's what I would ask you to comment on, please.

Answer (Dr. Marland): I think that if I could paraphrase Dr. Williams' expression of concern, it would be this: Does the present initiative of this administration to move toward revenue sharing and correspondingly to distribute the monies to states and local schools and Governors, eliminate the good progress we have made over the past several years in building in federal regulations and constraints to see to it that to the maximum degree, the money reaches the intended object, namely, the disadvantaged child such as would be in Title I, often a minority child?

The special revenue-sharing bill has not yet gone to Congress. The bill that we had in last year very carefully sustained those same Federal regulatory conditions that had prevailed. For example, the way our bill read last year—and it will probably go back up again in the next two or three weeks—was that every dime of what used to be the Title I monies that now becomes part of revenue sharing shall pass through and go to the communities in the same form and fashion that had prevailed before.

Number two, there shall be required by the state new advisory councils dealing with the uses of those monies, in which more than a simple majority of the members shall be representatives of the poor.

And a third feature built into the legislation has to do with comparability. Comparability was put into the law about a year-and-a-half ago. That meant that a community could not substitute the added monies from revenue sharing or from Title I for the monies that they would ordinarily be spending. As far as I know, the Administration will retain those very same regulatory conditions as it advanced the message of revenue sharing, and I for one will testify for it.

Dr. Marland: Another member of the audience has put his finger on an important issue: To what extent, particularly in higher education, are we attempting to influence the entire education establishment at the post-secondary level to ensure that there will be minority representation and, notably, Black involvement in policy-making positions?

Let me say that we in the Office of Education have come to where we feel that if we are going to make assertions about the need for upward mobility of minority people into policy-making positions, we'd put our own money where our mouth is. For the past two years, some 14 or 15 new minority people have assumed top policy-making positions in the Office of Education. As you well know, the federal government cannot prescribe the behavior of states, cannot prescribe the behavior of higher education institutions; but we can build in conditions that help to resolve the issue you are raising.

One of them I am going to ask Mr. Muirhead to develop a little bit more with you, because he is quite close to it, but I am going to treat it generally as follows. The legislation embraced in the Education Amendments of 1972 is now moving into place. One of the most far-reaching components in that legislation was a sleeper called 1202.

It establishes in every state a Commission for Post-Secondary Education, to be comprised of equitable representation of all the people, including ethnic representation and representation of women and youth. Now, I am going to ask Peter to develop that.

Mr. Muirhead: On the whole question of post-secondary education, I think we have to look at it in a little different milieu, if you will, than educational revenue-sharing, because, as a result of the amendments of 1972, there is now an opportunity for young people from all walks of life. It seems to me that we have not really given enough attention to that particular breakthrough in terms of the whole opportunity of access to post-secondary education in this country. There is now before the Congress a budget that provides for every young person to go beyond high school.

The other thing that we should bear in mind, that even in a very tight budget such as we have, the Title I Program remains at the same level. It is not reduced. In that program, you should notice that the highest percentage increase is to help Black colleges. Title III, Developing institutions Program, is increased in that budget from $52 million to $100 million, a $48 million increase. That is intended to enrich the programs of schools where there is a high incidence of minority students.

Dr. Marland: You might add that it's not just Black colleges, Peter, but Indians and Mexicans.

Mr. Muirhead: Oh, by all means. I want to underscore that it's directed at colleges that are serving all minority groups and is directed at enriching those programs with the particular thrust of improving their opportunities for graduate and professional education.

Question: What concerns me are those individuals who have alerady completed the post-secondary process and who are now in the career education field as individual professionals. How can there be some guarantee that these individuals will be in leadership roles in developing policies as relates to the thrust of career education?

Answer (Mr. Muirhead): Post-secondary commissions will be charged with responsibility of planning post-secondary education in each of the states, and by statute the composition of those commissions will have representation from minority groups who will be involved in the development of policy.

The other part of the equation is that the legislation that is opening up post-secondary opportunities for young people now says that student assistance programs shall be available to a whole variety of post-secondary institutions, including those institutions that will be putting particular emphasis on career education.

Dr. Marland: I think that there is another aspect of Mr. Gibbs' question we may not be getting at, and that is, very bluntly, how about top jobs for Blacks or other minorities? That gets back to what I was trying to say earlier We can't prescribe, unless we have different laws from those we have now, who shall be hired for what post. We are trying to set an example of that in the Office of Education and the Division of Education. We have made some progress at that end and it's honest progress; it's not make-believe. Most of the people who planned this meeting were dealing with top policy in the United States Government and many of them are minority people.

But you have right in this room people like Ulysses Byas and many of his colleagues, who are now superintendents of schools in large administrations where they are totally in charge of policy. Indeed, that record has been a swiftly increasing one over the past four or five years, and Ulysses may want to comment on his perception of progress in this direction as he sees it as chairman of the Black school superintendent groups.

Dr. Byas: The National Alliance of Black Superintendents is particualrly concerned with what goes into guidelines pursuant to a federal legislation passage, and it was from this case that we requested a meeting with Dr.Marland and with all of the top officials in the Office of Education to discuss this particular point because we know that what goes into the guidelines determines who comes out on top in terms of their proposals.

Let me just add one other aspect, because we who work in the states, particularly the states of the South, are vitally concerned. When we talk about some of the State Departments of Education in 1973, they are lily-white from the janitor up through the state superintendent. I refer to the fact that we have some hostile winds. Even though the winds are not as hostile as they once were, the sources that supply those winds are still there. They haven't been changed.

Question: As a legislator, I am involved in cases in which school districts cannot have a good vocational or occupational program because we haven't got the local funding resources, because the district is poor. At the other end, the Chicanos are not going to college because of the tremendous barriers in our existing economic structure. If you are trying to get a child from a ghetto school into medical school, you are confronted with the testing, which is very tough. It is geared to the middle-class white American. If you try to get into law school, your barrier is LSAT, which is geared to middle-class white American. If you're trying to get into dental school, you have got your dental testing program that blocks you out and keeps you out, to the extent that in Texas, the five largest universities—North Texas, Texas Tech, University of Houston, University of Texas at Austin, and Texas A&M—only have 2.5 percent Mexican American Chicanos enrolled—whereas our population breakdown in the state is 18 percent.

Let me give you another for-instance: Of the 1700 enrolled in law school at Texas University last year, there were 9 Chicanos that were able to pass the LSAT and no Blacks. Absolutely. In a state where we have approximately 14 percent Blacks and 18 percent Chicanos.

So, my question is: Unless we are dealing with career education as another form of revenue and unless we are going to put money meaningfully into some of these poor districts to upgrade vocational and occupational training and to open up and tear down some of these barriers of testing and provide grants to send some of the minorities to schools, law schools, dental schools, and professional schools, I have to look at career education as just one more bit of rhetoric that doesn't mean anything for the minorities.

Answer (Dr. Marland): That's exactly why we're here, exactly why we're trying to create career education to respond to this condition. Let me just give one quick footnote. There are already a half-billion dollars going from the Office of Education to assist just such communities as Edgewood. Those monies are now going there for vocational and occupational education. We would like to see much more money go there; but not merely to have more of the same in terms of the traditional vocational education, which hasn't made a difference for the past 50 years in terms of the needs of minority people. That's why we are talking about career education.

Question: What's the response to the use of academic testing barriers?

Dr. Marland: I hope that the whole idea of career education comes through to you as an attempt to solve those very problems. It should not be viewed as another kind of vocational education. It's the wholeness of giving a person a reason for growing and learning and succeeding. You have heard Mr. Muirhead state that every young person now, for the first time in the history of this country, is entitled to the resources to go to college.

Question: I am doing something that is very uncommon for my people, and that is, the Asian Americans, I am being aggressive because I don't want to lose this opportunity to ask the high representative from the Office of Education a question. The Asian Americans have never demanded anything in the past. They have never really struck out for anything in the past, not because they didn't have any needs, but because of their—how shall I say—cultural background.

I would like to know from the high leadership here today, what consideration has OE given to the needs of the Asian Americans in this country? Has OE defined what those needs are?

And then let me give you an example: I speak particularly for the Chinese Americans. They have tremendous critical language needs. Out of the $35 million appropriated by Title VII for Education, how much of that has gone to the Chinese Americans?

Answer (Dr. Marland): I can't give you at this time the exact information on the numbers of dollars going to Oriental children's bilingual programs. A significant sum is going to this. We are going to continue to keep bilingual education as a very strong priority in the Division of Education.

I know that there are many, many children and Chinese families that are living both in deprivation and suffering from the handicap of a different language. You should know that bilingual education, however, was never intended by Congress to be a service program. We are reaching fewer than 10 percent of the bilingual children in the Mexican American community. We are reaching fewer than that in the Puerto Rican community.

Now it was never meant to be a service program in which the federal government would come in and provide bilingual education for all children. It was meant to be a demonstration program in an area in which there had been a complete absence of concern for the cultural differences (and I have to add that cultural as well as language differences, which handicapped many children.

We are now engaged, as you may know, in a major new program for television for bilingual and bicultural Spanish-speaking children. The major new investment should be on the air by next November.

Question: I just found out the dollar amount: It's $115,000 for one program in San Francisco out of $35 million. That's just one state and that's not a significant amount.

Answer (Dr. Marland): That's right, but in so stating, you should realize that these are viewed as demonstration programs to try to trigger the use of local monies after a demonstration has been carried out and found effective, to build on that program. You have to remember that the federal part of this exercise is quite a small one, about 7 or 8 percent of the total cost. The real dollars derived from state and local resources will probably continue in the foreseeable future, but we should see bilingual education as a demonstration activity and not a service program.

Friday Luncheon Addresses

The Honorable Augustus Hawkins

The morning session adjourned for lunch. Presiding at the luncheon program was Reginald Petty, who introduced the first speaker, the Honorable Augustus Hawkins, member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the 21st District, California. His remarks follow:

More than 2.5 million students each year leave formal educational institutions without adequate preparation for careers. The unemployment rate among 18- to 24-year-olds in the inner cities and barrios is as high as 76 percent.

Career education has been proposed as a remedy for these obvious failures—for the low productivity of an $85 billion education industry—by relating a student's education and training to his life and career objectives.

At the risk of making myself a little unfriendly with some of you, I wish to describe what I consider my concept of the real nature and implications of a career education model. Perhaps my concept would differ from that proposed by many others.

I have no quarrel with the general definitions, although I think they can be criticized, because I believe that it is precisely in the broad implications of some of the definitions that there is much room for educational reforms. These reforms can extend into the communities that surround our schools of the future.

The concept of career development is generally defined as that aspect of human activity involved in learning about, preparing for, choosing, and benefiting from the series of work-related activities known as one's career. It is imperative that we apply to this definition the constitutional mandate of the Fourteenth Amendment, which required equality of educational opportunity. Most schools today do not provide equality. They are generally segregated by race and/or class, and their resources vary widely.

Career education, if it is to be within the law (and I am sure that educators would want it to be within the law), cannot extend, but must reduce these inequalities. What is the implication of this?

All the components of a career education program—teachers—equipment, access to all career clusters—cannot be replicated equally in the large number of schools that now exist. Most of them, as we all know, are facing financial crises. Imposing career education on a system of neighborhood schools would inevitably foster such evils as tracking, lack of opportunity for all but a small number of career options, and a continuation of poor quality education for children in poor schools.

I have some additional concerns about career education. First, I question the role of the schools in career education if they continue failing to teach simple verbal and computational skills necessary to quality for a job or career. We simply cannot afford the luxury of postponing the acquisition of good basic skills in favor of occupational awareness training.

Second, many employers will continue to be impressed by the college degree that is now beyond the reach of many poor and minority children. But while a needed attack on artificial job-entry requirements is being made, and I certainly hope we will continue to accelerate this, let us encourage our minority children who desire to, to get as extensive and as fine an education as possible.

Another question: How will career education allow for the development of multi-cultural interests, traditions, and studies? While we can agree that work is a major component of a person's life, other parts are equally important and are equally the province of formal education. Unless career education helps to develop a three-dimensional human being who has knowledge of and interest in his culture as well as the cultures of others and the many heritages that make up the humanities, it will have produced another robot in a materialistic society.

The promise of a job should be a primary goal of career education, but this mirage needs exposure. Last Tuesday, President Nixon announced that unemployment would be maintained at 4 percent or above, and I would anticipate that it will be much above rather than at 4 percent—presumably to prevent more inflation. Given this situation, I question the ability of the schools to find jobs for all students. Their choices will be meaningless unless the job opportunities are available. Those of us who have sponsored such employment programs and job creation activities thus far have not found much acceptance at the White House.

Publicity on career education has been broad and intense. It is the Number One educational topic. But in spite of the "hoopla," and untold numbers of speeches made by my very distinguished and able friend, Sidney Marland, minority reaction to career education is still one of suspicion. Touted as the ultimate solution, career education can end up just another bureaucratic dispersion of monies that are urgently needed for the effective education of minority students.

Worse, it may serve to divert minority children from the roads to higher education to the paths of occupational training.

For once, the minority communities are not waiting trustfully for the next panacea, but are questioning the concepts, the methods, and the motives behind the idea. Experience has taught us to be cynical. We know that this program can work only to the extent that employment and career opportunities for *all* people are actually improved.

One of the dangers we face in supporting this program is that the federal government will once again fail to undertake the long-term funding effort required for carrying out a major reform.

We certainly recall The Right to Read Program; we recall the revolution in education the President a year ago promised, particularly a revolution in fiscal funding. I was a co-author of a bill, the Emergency School Assistance Act, supported by the Administration. I supported this bill over the opposition of must of my Democratic colleagues on the Committee, and we put this bill into law to provide for desegregation. Now it is underfunded and has been abandoned.

The states, which will have responsibility for maintaining their own career education efforts, may lose interest in career education after it has consumed the bulk of existing money, and enthusiasm for education reform may be just another fad that fades from the classroom.

For example, it is significant and ominous that no new money will be dealt out by Washington for education this year. The total education budget has been but by 10 percent. Federal money for vocational education and other career education amounting to $168 million is coming from programs in the Office of Education whose place in the sun has been eliminated. Many of these programs are for students who need help the most—in compensatory education, the education for the handicapped.

Thus, I say to the Office of Education, and to the National Institute of Education, and to the President, we are not buying without examining. We will not accept this program without first having our questions answered, and even more, in action, not merely words.

I think that legislation must be passed before we can be assured that career education will do all of the things it promises. And it shouldn't, like Topsy, just grow up without some legislative base. This legislation should contain, in explicit language, the means for accomplishing all of its goals. I propose that such a bill be introduced and that hearings be held by the appropriate subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee.

I have some suggestions about what the bill should contain. Any legislative proposal should spell out the means for real cooperation between educational institutions and business and industry. If career education is going to work, it cannot be developed and carried out by the schools alone. The legislation should provide for integral involvement of the minority community—of nonprofessional as well as professional people—who are empowered to create, accept, or reject career education programs.

Without financial aid, many students will not be able to take advantage of post-secondary career education options available to them. These students must be helped, so that they are not screened out of college or whatever they decide to do, and the law should mandate their support.

To provide exposure for all students on the secondary level to all career options, it would be helpful to set up educational parks or comprehensive high schools central to a large number of students.

I, for one, have no hang-up over busing. I think that, for too long, this has spelled out a disunity among us. To me, it is just as safe to bus a child three, four, five, and even ten miles as it is for that child to walk four, five, or six blocks from his home. It isn't a question of the distance; it's a question of what is at the end of the walk or the ride.

The goals of education are to help prepare people to earn a living and to live their lives fully. There are three guarantees necessary to carry out these goals effectively.

First, for young people to achieve meaningful lives and meaningful employment, they must have equal educational opportunities. This means that all persons at any level will have equivalent opportunities to develop to their full potentials. This right must be guaranteed in the legislation.

The second guarantee to every person in school should be a suitable job in the occupation he has chosen and for which he has been trained and educated.

Finally, the legislation should contain provisions that would prevent racial discrimination in schools and in employment, both in hiring and promotion.

Without these three guarantees, career education will be but another vain proclamation and empty promise to those people who are always the neediest. I commend to this conference the initiation of efforts that will make these guarantees a reality and career education a nobler force than what has been proposed.

The Honorable William A. Steiger

At the conclusion of his address, Congressman Hawkins introduced the next speaker, the Honorable William A. Steiger, Sixth Congressional District, Wisconsin. His speech follows:

In this 93rd Congress, Gus Hawkins will serve as chairman and I as the ranking minority member of the Committee of Equal Opportunities, a new subcommittee that's been created. It indicates our wisdom, since that subcommittee has as its most important responsibility the Office of Economic Opportunity which has just been abolished. I am not quite sure what we are supposed to do about that nor, I suspect, is Gus any more sure than I of where that leaves us.

I have somewhat a different view than Gus does about career education, and I will offer you that about which I think those of us in politics are concerned. You don't need another bill on career education. That job has been done by the Congress. There are some other things to be concerned with.

It is, I think, fair to react to and understand the concern and fear expressed by those questions that I heard this morning to Dr. Marland, and some of what Gus Hawkins said in his remarks this afternoon.

If we're not careful, career education can be nothing but another put-up by either the federal government or anybody in education. That would be a first-class tragedy. And career education—if I followed closely what Gus said—is not training people for specific jobs upon graduation or attempting to guarantee them jobs upon graduation from high school. If it's nothing more than that, career education will have failed miserably and ought not ever to be undertaken.

And career education has no more nor less implications to minority groups than it has to people in the Sixth District, who are neither minority nor necessarily disadvantaged, but who suffer in exactly the same way minority groups suffer from the education system as it is now being operated.

This suffering assumes two aspects: One, we have not adequately insured that there are legitimate opportunities for people, be they in academic or vocational orientations, for those who are involved in the school system, but who are trapped now in general education. If Sid Marland does nothing more than to alert and awaken people to the loss that now takes place as a result of what we call general education at the elementary and secondary level, he will have performed a magnificent public service.

Secondly, the same kinds of proportions for middle-class and upper-class students as there are for those of the disadvantaged who are being short-changed. It would be wrong to assess this whole concept as one that has special implications for minorities, as contrasted to some other kind of implications for those who are in the middle- or upper-classes. All suffer equally or almost equally in the State of Wisconsin and, I suspect, across the country from the lacks and failures now present within our systems of education.

If I can give you just a short definition of what I see in career education: it is an opportunity available to children to have some knowledge of the world of work and of something other than going to college as the end-all and be-all of our lifetime in education. We must end what I am afraid is a myopia on the part of most in education, about how to succeed only by going to college, and make young people more aware of the range of opportunities that are available to them.

Third, we must look closely at those steps that have been taken by the Congress in its response to the problem of vocational occupation career education. We have confused people in 1972 by talking about occupational education as perhaps in the minds of some people as being different from vocational education. It really isn't; it's about the same.

But the Vocational Act of 1968 and the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1972, really focuses on three things.

One, we have said that counseling and guidence are fundamental to any efforts in this field, be they vocational career or academic. Those on the firing line in the field of counseling and guidance are going to need a much wider perspective on the kids with whom they work, a willingness to take the difficult kid as well as the easy kid, the kid who may not go to the University of Wisconsin or Yale or Harvard, but who can have, and ought to have, an opportunity.

Secondly, the Congress is saying that this is a field in which there is a unique federal responsibility. One of the questions asked this morning had to do with the concept of the cost of career education and the imposition of this program at the local level without additional funds creating a tremendous hardship. If that questioner is right, I think the Congress is going to have to do a better job, as is the Administration, in responding to the concern over costs, be it in counseling and guidance, in equipment and resources, or in teachers.

It does cost the local school district more, thus the federal government has a particular responsibility in this field, as it has had in fields like bilingual education and education for the disadvantaged and the handicapped, for all of which we could justify additional funds from the federal government.

And third, we have said to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that we have mandated a Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education. This was a step taken by the Congress after having watched for four years since 1968 when we faced this problem in the Vocational Act Amendments of that year. At that time, I offered the amendment to create a Bureau. It was defeated because my colleagues said, "Steiger, don't try and tell the Executive Branch how to run its shop. They will do the job well."

I waited four years and they didn't do the job well. If there is any effort by the Executive Branch to downplay the meaning of that Bureau, to deflect its broad mandate, and to deflect the concern of the Congress that there be greater attention and greater awareness of vocational career education, they're going to run smack into another Executive/Legislative confrontation, which won't be much different than the confrontations in which they are now involved.

So I'm not all all convinced that you need another bill in career education. If we need to go back and look at those pieces of legislation that have been adopted, let's do that in an effort to preserve and protect the concerns that Gus Hawkins and many of you reflected.

But I really don't think you have to go through this battle again, because the foundation is there. But, even assuming that the legislative base is in place, the implementation of that legislation is always a hell of a lot more difficult than the simple act of passing a bill. If there's any myopia to which Shirley Chisholm and Bill Steiger and Gus Hawkisn are a part, it's that myopia that says the answer to every problem is to pass a bill.

And it isn't. The kinds of concerns that you have in this room can and should be related in three ways: One, directly to those members of the Congress who are dealing with this issue. If you are afraid of what's happening in career education, if you don't think what's being done is appropriate, then let us know what you think we ought to be doing to legitimately play a role in overseeing those Acts of the Congress already adopted.

Secondly, recognize the resource of the Advisory Council, which has performed a tremendous service, both in terms of getting a greater awareness among a lot of people about vocational career education and in dealing with specific problems at the local, state, and federal levels. The Advisory Council ought to be used more extensively than ever before.

Third, the place where most of the action is at this point is the local school districts. All of you can meet in Washington and enjoy the sights and sounds of the Sheraton Park Hotel, but this city and what we do as a government has limits. What you do at the local level is infinitely greater and more productive.

Thus, I would urge all of you to be more perceptive about your own role and your own ability to influence, not just your federal legislator, but your state legislator and your school board members as well, because if career education as a concept to help young people do a better job in this society becomes implemented and is workable, it is workable only to the extent that all of you have done your work.

Friday Afternoon Session: Report of Reaction Groups

At 2 p.m. on Friday "Reactions Sessions" were held, for which conference attendees were asked to scatter at random and join with any group they chose. No particular topics were assigned to any group; all were simply asked to react to any specific statements that the participants had heard during the first day's activities or to any of the information disseminated through the model sessions. It was felt that the attendees now had enough information on career education to begin to comment, react, and pursue and develop the various ideas discussed. A reporter and a resource person were assigned to each group.

At 4 p.m., the general session reconvened to hear the reports of the reaction groups, which are presented here in a somewhat condensed form. Many provocative questions were raised and comments made. Some were developed quite fully; others were mentioned only briefly, in skeletal form. To accommodate the disparity of presentations, the editors have included some of the reports in full, with only minor editing and deletion of extraneous remarks. In others of the group reports, where a pattern of similar reactions emerged, the editors have chosen typical ideas and presented a list of these. Inasmuch as it was felt that all the ideas and questions reported represented a consensus of the groups' reactions, we have deleted the names of the reporters and session chairmen from this section. (These individuals are identified in the Agenda, Appendix A).

Group VI*

There were general recommendations made that the group felt are prerequisites to the success of the Career Education Program.

1. That this conference go on record as requesting Congress to increase the education budget, replace funds deleted by President Nixon.

2. That Congress strenuously resist President's authority to impound appropriated funds.

3. That Congress oppose all efforts to limit school integration.

Rationale: That career education, along with all other education programs, faces a dismal future at the hands of a President who stressed greater importance on a military budget, while he decimates social domestic education programs.

Except that Congress regains it autonomy and takes away the Executive Branch's control of the Office of Management and Budget, Congressional appropriations have no meaning.

Unless schools are totally integrated and the career education concept is applied to all students, the chance is greater that tracking and other devious techniques will be employed to direct minorities into stereotyped career channels. We feel that the "no strings attached" euphemism associated with federal revenue sharing adds to justify minority skepticism if career education becomes a part of a revenue sharing package.

That the aforementioned general concerns be officially adopted by this group and conveyed to the Congress by whatever means devised by the chairmen of the various minority caucuses assembled.

That conference participants organize "grass roots" campaigns in their local communities to convey the aforementioned desires to Congressmen from their district via letters and petitions.

**This group's report was submitted after the conference in typed form, and the editors felt that it would be useful to include it in full.*

Specific Recommendations

1. That the career education budget be expanded and redirected to include formation of guidelines and curriculum development from the Office of Education to give states direction in these areas.

   Rationale: States that have historically discriminated against minorities through the use of biased texts and curriculum materials cannot be expected to develop non-biased materials of their own volition.

2. That the Office of Civil Rights be held to its responsibility to apply and enforce existing anti-discrimination laws under Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, with application of penalties where infractions occur.

   Rationale: School districts with high minority student explusion and suspension records and minority teacher-principal dismissal and demotion will not deal fairly with minorites in career education. Businesses with a previous record of Title VII violations need monitoring, as well as those with low visibility or absence of minorities in their work force.

3. That the role in career education of the U.S. Department of Labor be expanded so as to put into proper perspective the responsibility of the Department to increase the availability of jobs for persons who benefit from career education programs. That the Department of Labor exert its influence in combatting existing racism in labor unions.

4. That no U.S.O.E. contract be given any organization or agency that does not have minorities represented at all levels of its operation.

5. That there be special provisions in the budget and program development of career education, to include:

   (a) Counselor-teacher-principal reorientation

   (b) The development of culture-free tests

   (c) A special program within the career education concept directed towards reorienting dropouts for reentry into the education system

6. That there be a roster developed of minorities, designating ethnic origin, who participated in the development of the career education concept and are presently a part of the program's implementation. Names, addresses, and credentials of these persons should be made available immediately to participants of this conference. That there be reciprocal communication between these persons and the ethnic community they represent.

Group VII

This session addressed five major categories of concern:

1. **Racism in American education.** All career education models should include a staff development component to help educators improve their attitudes and behaviors toward minority students.

2. **Job opportunities.** Career education programs should be accompanied by federal effort to encourage job opportunities for upward mobility among minority groups, if career education is to have any relationship and effect in decreasing poverty among minorities. Also, there must be a federal effort to assure that jobs are indeed available after individuals have been subjected to career awareness, exploration, and preparation. This might require a federal role in the creation of jobs and in eliminating job discrimination.

3. **Role of students, young people, and parents in career education policy-making.** Students and/or young people in secondary or post-secondary schools should be involved in planning

and implementing career education programs, as well as career education conferences, including this one. The expectations and involvement of parents in generating career education policy on the local level will enhance minority students' self-worth and self-respect.

4. **Continuity, sequence, and integration of career education learning opportunities.** There should be coordination of career education efforts between the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels. That need has not been addressed so far during this conference, yet such coordination between these various levels is very necessary.

5. **Accountability of funds allocated for career education programs.** Under the new funding system of revenue sharing, guidelines for career education need to be developed and enforced to make sure that the money is indeed spent where it should be and so that local officials are not able to spend the money on other programs, as has often occurred in the past.

Group VIII

There seems to be an air of frustration among many (here at the conference). We have been asked to critique the concept of career education, a concept that has no definition. How can we critique something that has no definition? We believe that the powers-that-be should at least set outside limits on a working definition of career education. We also sensed a credibility gap in what is being presented and what the realities of today actually are.

Why haven't the projects already funded been presented in detail, so that at least we would have an opportunity to have a base from which to work? Why haven't we been advised thoroughly about the implications of 1202 State Commissions?* Why haven't we seen copies of this legislation? Why haven't we been presented with the fact that all federal money going to states related to higher education must go through states' 1202 Commissions?

This has a tremendous implication for minorities: What control will we have over the output of this conference? What guarantee will we have that the reports will not be used against us in the future?

We sense that this conference has divided us more than bringing us together. Each racial ethnic group was asked to have a separate caucus last night. We see the results of this tactic where each of us end up fighting for our own cause, our own pet project. The pie is only so big and each of us has been caught up in a trap of a conference by fighting for the same pieces of pie. We have to either expand the pie or start baking new and larger cakes.

We sense dangers in the concept of career education and that we are dealing with ideal models rather than realism. Under career education, we are raising the aspirations of some folks and we are telling them that they can specialize in any of 15 clusters and that they can "spin out" and "spin in."

We are telling minorities that they can aspire to be neuro-surgeons, electricians, attorneys. What are the realities? What about the spinner who attempts to spin in? What happens when the realities of institutional racism hit the spinner in the face? Somebody in our discussion group said, "There will probably be some barbeques."

What about the realities of the cost of financing education today? How can we help the spinner who cannot afford to spin? We must include in the definition of career education, a financial support system.

What about the realities of a limited number of jobs in many of the clusters, especially in the technical areas, because of automation? What clusters do we as minorities fit into? Will we be steered in the technical clusters or clusters that might have no future because of automation? We must include within the definition of career education, constant detailed manpower projections.

We seem to be in agreement that minority groups should have input into the decision-making progress of programs for career education, but because of the smallness of the pie at this point, there is more of a priority that we be involved in the decision-making echelons of the powers-that-be.

The next battle line will be drawn at the state level within these 1202 State Commissions. There are no guidelines in many states when it comes to minority representation on the commissions. Rather than fighting among ourselves for a piece of the pie that hasn't even been baked yet in Washington, let's go back to our states and make sure that we have an important role in working up the apple pie recipe. We recommend that the next conference be entitled "1202 State Commissions: Implications for Minorities," and that it be held in May when the Japanese cherry trees blossom.

---

*Reginald Petty interjected an explanation that the 1202 Commission is the Post Secondary Education Commission and promised attendees copies of the legislation and guidelines.

Group X

The continuing reference to business and industry is an indication that there is a need for broader involvement from this sector or segment of American society, which appears to have been inadequate. Articles from official publications of business and industry have very little to say about career education. We are finding more on career education in educational magazines.

Unless we approach career education from a practical and realistic point of view, we are likely to be intensifying and magnifying the frustration of our youth, because career education raises their expectancy level. This is especially significant when we realize that about 100 million people now make up the labor force. The Nixon administration had mandated that, to control inflation, we need to have four-million people unemployed. You and I know who most of these four million people will be. How can we calmly accept a four percent national policy on unemployment? That means 20, 30, or even 40 percent among the minorities.

This tragedy is being perpetuated upon the American society under the guise of a need to control inflation. Business and industry have been involved in curriculum development to a limited extent, as evidenced by the models being developed.

These models are transportable materials that have national scope and design. The timing and planning for the whole career concept has been most difficult. We cannot go back, but how do we move forward? Inadequate attention has been given to how people think about their jobs. Among the white-collar workers, it is said that 80 to 85 percent are reasonably satisfied with the jobs that they have pursued, whereas, among the blue-collar workers it is 35 to 40 percent.

There is a critical need for career education for teachers, because too few of them are aware of the real world. We are concerned about trapping children in school with early decisions made and based upon inappropriate and inadequate tools for guidance and counseling.

As proposed, career education presents too wide a gap between theory and practice. Because of the practical success of the program, career education as well as any other program needs to be measured by educators and students in terms of job placement.

The program seems in a sense to be doomed to much failure; someone has siad as much as 83 percent. Intellectual development of the people as a whole must be regarded as a natural resource, and education is the first step in maximizing this resource. The availability of the jobs for all is the only way to assure that the nation does not abuse its resources.

One analogy is appropriate. Quoting from what is supposed to have been uttered by John Adams in 1780, he said that he "must study politics and war in order that his sons may study mathematics, geography, history, naval architecture and so on in order that their children, the third generation, might study music, art, and so forth."

There are some priorities, and just as politics and war were survival skills for John Adams in 1780, reading, mathematics, and the use of language are survival skills that are basic requirements for minorities in 1973.

We have three special recommendations as follows: (1) Someone—the persons responsible for calling this conference perhaps—should make certain that we get a status report from the United States Office of Education responding to the questions and concerns that have been raised. We have given too much time merely to raised questions; there should also be some replies and answers. (2) What is the Office of Education or the National Institute of Education doing for the private sector? And (3) how can we have continued regulations, regardless of special revenue sharing, to insure that funds and resources go to train minorities for the apprenticeships for skilled trades, and other forms of education to be sure that minorities get a fair share?

Comments, Concerns, and Questions

The following random comments were picked by the editors from the transcript of the other sessions as being particularly cogent or representative.

1. Placement is one of the biggest problems in career education. The community people don't know enough about the way it will be implemented.
2. Training of teachers, administrators, counselors, and everyone involved in education is an issue. What is being taught should be more realistic, not only concerning subject matter, but also in their attitudes and disposition to deal with career education as it pertains to minorities.
3. Given the amount of money being put into the programs, all we're going to get is a demonstration program, which we don't want.
4. If you try to introduce changes into the system without changing the concepts of the system, the efforts will be in vain. First we must try to change the concepts of the system.
5. As more white students go into vocational training, more minority students are being left out.
6. Will career education be integrated into the existing curriculum? There ought to be a "watch dog"

to see that monies are allocated to the right people. This could be accomplished through community involvement, except that some States have no community involvement in career education decisions. Georgia's career education program was thrown down people's throats without their knowing anything about it.

7. Basic change in education is needed before career education can be successful. The change from one plan to another is not enough. The credential system should be changed before career education can be successful.

8. What can be the effect of career education on a segregated school system? What are the relationships between the many individual groups of the OE and NIE? To whom are the people who implement career education programs responsible? Are there special projects for certain groups of students?

9. Career education leaders have not yet built in safeguards for minorities, and the success of career education is dependent upon supervision of the lowest level of the educational delivery system.

10. Is career education intended for the non-achieving student?

11. There was confusion over the real definition and concept of career education. Where does it begin and how? Where is it initiated? Is it a new name for an old process? If it is, then the problems are still the same and will remain.

12. Counselors of Japanese Americans tell them they are good in the technical fields and tend to limit them to this. This limits the individual.

13. If career education is a means to solve the problems in the present educational system, there should be a new approach in the primary grades. For instance, if a child would like to become a reporter or his interest is in writing, is he going to be able to pursue that interest and be guided accordingly? But the child must ask, "Is it going to satisfy me? Is there total educational opportunity waiting for me at the end of the rainbow?"

14. Home influence cannot be depended upon to stimulate vocational choice because of lack of opportunities on the part of minority families to be able to actually influence the child.

15. We talk about American values and the American way of life, but we have forgotten the real Native American's values and concerns. The whole school structure and educational system should look more closely at the Indian American. It's true we have to live (materially), but the essence of living is how we live. Our dignities and pride should be considered. People who have talents in handicrafts can do this and be employable, but is that all that they can do? Have they reached their potential if we have given them some employment just so they can live from day to day, without aspirations or without at least motivations to aspire?

16. Concerning a Black electrician's union, where 75 apprentices were supposed to be taken in in a year: The white electricians, in cooperation with the state and local government, trained young Blacks for one purpose—to take the apprenticeship tests. Thirty Blacks passed the written test, but then only two were taken in. Should new unions be organized?

17. There is concern over business and industry input. Are they really open to employing minority group members or is it just token employment, to say, "I have one or two minorities here"?

18. Minorities must become more involved in policy-making and decision-making structures at all levels—local, state, federal, boards of trustees of schools, and institutions.

19. How will career education be implemented? For positive steps for minorities to be considered and accepted, there should be more studies on different minority groups, their problems, their concerns, their interests, as they relate to the so-called career education.

20. Local bi-lingual programs help minorities to compete in the job market. People must have communication skills in the dominant tongue to be able to verbalize or write what their concerns are.

21. NIE should do a survey of career education models in each state and disseminate study results at the local level to people who can use them. Existing committees should be strengthened and utilized, as opposed to creating new committees.

22. Learning experiences should be developed by input from teachers, who are the key program implementers. The need for teacher retraining in the area of career education was outlined. This includes familiarizing the teacher with both the world of work and the child's environment.

23. A major public relations effort should be initiated to transmit the concept of career education to the people through the humanization of various communication media.

24. The figures that lead to stereotyping on the basis of sex (a lady at a typewriter and a gentleman wearing a hard hat) should be taken out of the symbols on the cover of the career education pamphlet. Just include the typewriter and the hard hat.

25. Make sure that ample provisions have been made in revenue-sharing categories for career education funds. More general education funds should be allocated for career education.

26. Guidelines should be formulated by the Office of Education, rather than being left to the states, as the program presently plans to do. There should be a vehicle for monitoring these guidelines, a vehicle for their endorsement, and provision for penalties when the guidelines are not followed.

27. There should be extensive curriculum development by minorities themselves and testing procedures now used in the educational systems should be revamped.
28. It is asinine to suggest that white folk have suffered as much as Blacks or other minorities; this statement should not go unchallenged.
29. The linguistically and culturally disadvantaged should not be ignored if career education is to fulfill the needs of all.
30. What people are looking for is a job. They don't care how many concepts or how many structures you have. You must have for them a job. They are thinking about their own personal individual needs, not what somebody else has structured for them.
31. We cannot divorce career education from the delivery of complete social services. The people in New York have gotten together with the Mayor, demanding these kinds of things for all the minorities, representing everybody. They get their child care and dental care, and are working toward the elimination of drug abuse—the whole gamut of personal and family needs that cannot be divorced from the educational process.
32. Minority women have borne the brunt of a poor educational system, of promises that are not delivered by the federal government.
33. Reference was made to a remark in a Vice-Presidential speech that, "Too many people go to college." This kind of statement should be looked at very carefully—who are the "too many people"? They are not from our groups.
34. We cannot depend on federal funding, anyhow. We must go back to our own community for funding. The responsibility, the planning must come from each and every one of us. The federal government and the state only can guide us, give us the resources that we might need as time goes by.

Friday Evening: Dinner Program

Friday evening at 6:00 p.m., a reception was held for all attendees, followed by dinner. The first two dinner speakers were introduced by Sister Adelo Arroyo. Their remarks appear here, edited and shortened.

Ms. Anna Chennault

First to speak was Ms. Anna Chennault, co-chairman of the Republican Party's Minorities Division, vice president of international affairs for the Flying Tigers line, writer, educator, and lecturer. Her address follows:

As minorities in this country, we realize that to be recognized as first-class citizens just doing a first-class performance is not good enough; we need first-class unity and cooperation among ourselves. This is why it is so important for us to have occasions of getting together to learn from each other and to help each other.

Tonight I would like to point out that I speak as a representative of the Asian minorities, the Asian Americans. As you know, the Asian Americans only represent less than two percent of the American population. Therefore, we are the minority of the minorities. Sometimes we are considered the silent minority, but we are not asking only what this country can do for us; we are asking what we can do together for this country.

In the morning of the Seventies, we have witnessed a lot of changes. This is a new era, an era of opportunities, an era of challenge, an era of plenty of trouble, and yet never empty of hope. There are many important issues confronting the minorities. Yesterday was already too late. It has been a long journey for all of us and I'm sure each one of us shares the same frustrations, the same disappointments. Therefore, today we particularly want to pay tribute to those unsung men and women who diligently and patiently overcame the prejudices and problems with dignity, compassion, dedication, and hard work. You certainly represent these people.

However, a few prefer not to be involved or are even afraid to be involved. This needs to be changed if we would make improvements. We must seek to involve responsible people to build strong leadership, to meet the ever-changing social environment we move in today. We salute and uphold our dedicated Asian American leaders, and we encourage and call for the total involvement of other Asian Americans in all communities to come forward to take on their share of obligations and responsibilities.

It is not that the Asian American lacks talent, knowledge, or goodwill; but we have too much apathy among us. We must take a positive approach, not a negative attitude.

The Asian Chinese Americans should not be, and they are not, satisfied just to serve chop suey and egg roll in the restaurants, and I'm sure they are all getting tired of taking care of other people's laundry. And, I think there are many other things the Japanese can do besides taking up gardening. (Of course, we all recognize the Chinese are very good cooks and the Japanese are very good gardeners.)

Asian Americans want equal opportunity, not second-class citizenship. This talented people with their rich culture could increase the contribution to this country even more once their ability and their knowledge are fully recognized and channels of opportunity are justifiably provided.

We gather here tonight to talk about career education. What can be more important than enriched knowledge of the individual? But in order to improve the opportunities for education for Asian Americans, it is important for the people concerned to seek Asian American participation.

For the administrators of career education, there are three major issues: enough funding to do the job, knowing how to do the job properly, and the opportunity for career education to be distributed equally and fairly.

In the past, I don't think anyone has taken the time to look into career education for the Asian minorities realistically and practically. Sometimes, maybe because they have been so silent, people didn't think their problems existed. Asian Americans are different from the other minorities and some of their problems are unique.

To help these people to help themselves, the Asian Americans must be allowed to participate in the policy-making roles and not continue to be subordinate. Decisions concerning Asian Americans cannot be decided by the white and Black alone. We must be allowed to go into the conference room and have a part in decision-making. To be effective, Asian Americans must be included as policy-makers.

Asian Americans actually do not want to be on the receiving end for handouts. Give them the opportunity, give them the tools. They can play an important role to the mainstream of American life and stand up as proud Americans. Their problems are our problems and their achievements would only add strength to this country.

Historically speaking, Asian Americans have been a traditional people, rather conservative in their nature. I would like them to speak up, to stand up and speak on the issues and discuss their problems, not to keep silent all the time.

These people have been denied equal participation in the rights and privileges given to the other minority groups. In fact, there seems to be a myth that the Asian Americans do not need help. This attitude must be changed. We must seek equal participation for the Asian American in the development, operation, administration, and funding for educational programs, because only in that way can we make improvements.

Now, how to accomplish the three dimensions I just mentioned? It is not an easy task. Speaking as an Asian American, we ask for those concerned to recognize the Asian American in this country. In any new task, there are always additional problems, but the path of change has never been easy.

We must allow the Asian American to come out from their forced isolation and end the long years of painful discriminations and neglect against this small minority.

I used to often hear that the Chinese or the Japanese community take care of their own people. However, these communities in all the big cities are growing to such an extent that it is beyond their own ability to take care of themselves, even if they wanted to.

As part of the American heritage, if we ignore the fact that the Asian American needs help, that is insulting to us. Recognizing the fact and not trying to seek solutions would be inexcusable. The Asian American community needs much improvement. Some of the improvements require a new approach, and one new approach is to strengthen education.

President Nixon, in his State of the Union message, mentioned career education:

> "There is no more disconcerting waste than the waste of human potential and there is no better investment than an investment in human fulfillment. Career education can help make education and training more meaningful for the student, more rewarding for the teachers and more available to the adults, more useful for the disadvantaged and more productive for our country."

We gather here this evening to exchange information about a common interest—education. I think we can all be encouraged that we have moved a long way, but we still have a long, long way to go. Let's not be too critical of some of our failures and our disappointments, but at the same time not be over-confident of our accomplishments and successes.

We expect and encourage new directions as well as new ideas and we call on you concerned people to take on more responsibilities to make that change possible.

To combine heritages from different people is one of the elements to give strength to this great land of America. Let us combine our strength and our effort to face the new challenge. Let us see what we can do together to help each other as the minorities, to bring better education for all.

Mr. Arthur Fletcher

The evening's second speaker was Arthur Fletcher, executive director of the United Negro College Fund. Mr. Fletcher served as alternative representative of the U.S.A., to the 26th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and prior to that was Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards of the U.S. Department of Labor. He is currently chairman of the Domestic Council Cabinet Committee for the Elimination of Economic Discrimination. His address follows:

What I felt was missing when I came out of high school was the fact that I didn't come out of school with a skill. I came out of high school with a good reputation as a football player, with a strong back and strong muscles, and there was an ice house down the street that needed an iceman.

But everytime I went somewhere to go to work, I could never forget the feeling that I had a diploma and yet really hadn't been trained to do anything, but carry the football, play a little basketball, and run on the track team.

If it hadn't been for the Army and World War II, Lord knows what I would have done, other than possibly go on to Northwestern or Indiana University on another football scholarship. There again, the way they were treating Black athletes in those days, I would have taken some courses in basket weaving and camping and several other things, played out my college eligibility, and hoped to get a professional football contract and play that out. When I got through, I still wouldn't have had anything to do.

The situation hasn't changed a whole lot right now. Not only are high school youngsters graduating out of high school without any specific ideas as to what they are going to do from the career point of view, but there are a whole lot of youngsters finishing junior college with still no idea as to what they are going to do for the rest of their lives, the 42 years that the average person spends in the work force.

And so it's kind of a delight to find that we are finally getting ready to address the fact that something ought to be going on, both in elementary and junior high and high school and post-secondary school work, that aims in the direction of a career.

There will probably be some discussion about how fast careers become obsolete because of automation and changing demands. It's true that careers do become obsolete, but I have found that it's much easier to shift from one career to another as a result of change, than start with no career and try to acquire one.

Manpower studies have showed that it is much easier to retrain a person who is already employed in some industry (for instance, the glass industry)and is losing his job because of automation. You could keep them on payrolls and in the industrial work force easier than taking an individual who had never had a job or acquired skills and move that individual through skill acquisition into a job.

So it is a delight for me to be here this evening and find that OE and you who are involved, not only with people's minds, but their hands, are beginning to talk about skill acquisition, the kinds of skills that can be used in the work world, in the elementary, junior, senior, and post-graduate areas.

I'm not going to make a pitch for the United Negro College Fund, but I do feel it's important to hammer our theme in to you. If you haven't seen it, our theme is: "A mind is a very terrible thing to waste." We are talking about all minds: Asiatic minds, Indian minds, Chicano minds, Black minds, and poor white minds. We put the emphasis on the mind, not the color. And we have wasted all kinds minds in this country: Black, yellow, Indian, red, whatever you want to call them. So is human energy a terrible thing to waste, especially when it's expended because it doesn't have the direction that a well-trained mind could provide.

Ms. Elizabeth Duncan Koontz

The final presentation of the evening was made by Elizabeth Duncan Koontz, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor.

She introduced a minority member of her staff who was present, Mary Natani (Native American), and mentioned several others. Mrs. Koontz' speech follows:

We have had a lot of speeches and panels and caucuses, some informal conversations, we've had films. You've run the gamut, and I imagine that some of you at this time are wondering if we can get it all together. I think we can, but your next question ought to be, "Can we make it work?" I think we can not leave here unless we can settle on that one factor. Not will it work for us, but can *we* make it work, because it won't just happen; it's got to be made to happen. I don't believe that there is anything that can't be done if people put their minds to it.

But I am going to say here at the outset, if we are stupid enough to let people play us off one against the other, then we all ought to lose.

We have talked about our various ethnic and racial groups and about revamping the educational process. I am concerned that we focus a little interest on another group, one that's treated as a minority, but is really a majority. It cuts across every racial ethnic group and all together they make up 51 percent of the population. There is a women's movement in this cuontry and it is real, but the elimination of sex discrimination applies to men, too.

Even though we are here as racial/ethnic groups trying to get it together so that we can make things happen for us, there are still people who don't recognize that women are a part of people, and those among minorities are going to have to recognize it.

The second thing we must recognize is that we have a middle-class that's peculiar to this country. It got that way because husbands and wives both worked and contributed to family income. I'm not talking about the middle-class social status, whatever it is, but about adequate health care for families, a decent place to live, some savings that you can use, not for a rainy day, but for whatever you decide they are to be used for. I'm talking about adequate clothing and entertainment that can prevent some of the kinds of situations that our children face because there is no way to look up.

That's what economic status means. Most people who are making it did not get that way by keeping women at home, unless they started out with money. They got it by working together and pulling together and deciding among themselves when they could afford to pull back. We are doing an injustice when we allow ourselves to make this same mistake that the majority in this country made and is now having to deal with, because everybody is recognizing that, as Art said, "The waste of mind is a terrible thing."

We are talking about talents. This movement must not be viewed by minority males or females as a threat by white women to minority male employment, because minority females have been getting the shaft too. We have Federal programs that state specifically, "for minorities," but they mean "minority males." There are still laws that prevent women asserting their rights, even if they've got money. They still cannot get credit.

This is legal discrimination. If we're going to demand the elimination of discrimination, it's going to start with us, not only on the basis of race or national origin, but also religion and sex. You can't pick the kind of discrimination you are going to let go along. You either fight it or you forget it. Discrimination covers the board, it is so pervasive that if you let in one kind, you've let in the others, too.

Much of this is related to what's called masculinity. I don't know about a lot of these other women here, but I've been hearing folks tell that I, as a black women, have emasculated black men, and I want you to know I wasn't even here when that emasculation took place. I don't want my black brothers running around keeping me down because they *think* I did it. We all know where the target is. I'll get you some economic status facts in a few minutes and we'll know where it is.

Let's deal with some other kinds of realities. It's assumed that men and women will assume one role in their lifetimes and that the early years are supposed to be spent in preparation for that role. That is more nearly true for men than for women. You know about it. before a baby is born, everybody hopes it will be a boy so he can carry on the family name. But we can change all that right now by changing the law about what kind of names people use. In some countries, children carry the names of the mothers.

Another example: before a baby is born, a football is given to him. And his daddy is mad if he doesn't want to play with it. We'be already decided, "Sonny, you are going to like football or else!" Never mind that he has a fine, sensitive mind; never mind that he wants to be a scientist; never mind that he is going to be a violinist or a pianist or anything; never that. If he's a boy, he's supposed to act this way, and if he doesn't, "Then we'll beat it into him."

And he's going to learn at nine months that boys don't cry. Now, have you ever seen a nine-months-old baby? You can tell him that boys don't cry, but he is going to cry. And at four he is going to be asked, what does he want to be; a doctor, a lawyer, an engineers, a fireman, a policeman? They never do ask him, "Are you going to be a bus boy?" Some of them know that's about where he's going to wind up, according to things today.

The thing that's unforgiveable is if he wants to play with a doll or a tea set. He doesn't know that he's a boy yet, but he just can't do that. Never mind that the world's greatest chefs are men; never mind that some of the tailors of the world are men. Isn't that strange?

It's all right for him to get up there and make $50,000 a year as a chef if he manages, through this culture, to withstand all that's being said about him as he learns to cook. But God help him if he wants to take home economics.

Of course, if it turns out that he's apt, we're going to push him into professional school. It doesn't matter if he does want to be a mechanic, he's got to be a professional. Better he should be a number-one mechanic and set up a business, so that he can own some of that business and pour our money into it and have it returned to the community, than be a half-rate, second-rate lawyer or doctor.

What I am getting at is that, in a boy's life, he is being career-oriented from the first, whether he ever gets there or not. He is already being told that he is expected to think about his future.

Females are not quite like that. It's almost like that. Now from the day she is born, her mother is planning what kind of pretty ribbons, what kind of pretty dresses she is going to give her, and she is taught to kiss everybody. She is reared to be a housewife and a mother. From the very beginning, when she wants to go out and play with the little boys, or tag along with her father, because her brothers and father have so much fun, she is told, "You stay home with and help clean the house." I don't know many housewives who like cleaning that house. They might like decorating it, but keeping that house is drudgery, day in and day out. But girls are supposed to like it, because they were born females.

The boy grows up career-oriented, learning early that he is expected to grow into a man who is taken by some woman who wants a husband to provide for her, and that they will have children. Somebody will have to stay home and take care of them and rear them, because he will not be bothered with those little snotty noses. He will take them when they get all dressed up and say, "There's my boy," after they get all cleaned up, but somebody has got to do the other part. That's the mother's role.

The only trouble is, women don't stay pregnant all of their lives. They are having fewer children. They work longer and stay on the job, and child rearing doesn't take as long, because everybody is struggling to give their children the best start they can. As soon as possible, parents who are able get them into nursery school and then kindergarten. These devices that have been provided through technology have helped to improve the quality of life for a lot of women.

Some women still have to go a block to get water or go outside to the street to the common spigot. Some women still wash clothes on a board or cook on a wood stove, but for the most part, with installment buying and people who can talk faster than folk can count their money, many, many homes—even of what we call the poor—have gas and electric stoves, electric lights, and washing machines. Sometimes they don't work, but for the most part, these conveniences have changed the length of time required to do the work. But the work still has to be done.

Many women are deserted or widowed and must take care of themselves, without job skills, because their husbands were not going to have their wives work and therefore concluded they didn't need any training, sometimes didn't need to finish high school.

For women, it's all right to go on welfare; for men, it's not. The tragedy is that, for many there is no recourse but welfare, because they are excluded from the management programs, the manpower programs, and from certain kinds of training, yet they have no way to take care of themselves.

We assume that every woman is going to have a man all of her life who will be able to take care of her and do her thinking for her. Nine out of ten girls will work at some time during their lives, but our schools treat them as if they only need something to fall back on.

This attitude also has an effect on men who are not able to make what it takes to support a family in the way they see on television. What does that do to that whatever it is we're calling masculinity? It causes many psychological problems. Some men act them out by beating their wives, by getting all the children they can, whether they can support them or not, or by withdrawing into alcohol or drugs. There are others who react by simply not recognizing that anyone else has brains, feelings, or opinions.

There are few black women who don't want to use an education once they've got it. I hope they will adopt the feeling that, to be somebody, they have got to sit down on their education. There is no minority group that has enough trained talent to represent in the many places that it needs to be represented, that should discourage its women from doing whatever their talent will allow.

We ought not make women choose between homemaking and careers. There are child-care arrangements that can help to develop children better than a lot of parents can, but there are periods when mothers want to be with their children and children need their mothers. We should also think about parents sharing responsibilities, so that fathers can be a part of the parental role beyond the getting, because our children in juvenile courts are saying that that's a part of the trouble.

There is such a thing as too much mothering. Everybody talks about "building the family unit," but how do you build it if the father is not there half the time? The whole responsibility to rear the children is left to mothers. Thus many women have undertaken it as a career, but what happens to you when your career fails? You run and hid, and that's what many women do emotionally and psychologically. Not that they are jealous of the fathers, not that they don't want to share their children, but we have given children to them as a career, and suddenly with everything they've done for them, the children prefer the father.

In the International Commission on the Status of Women representing the UN, women from around the world are talking about how can we divide up some of the responsibility. A friend of mine says it's all right if his wife wants to work, if she can manage a job outside and the house and take care of the laundry and take care of him, it's all right. But I don't want him to cry on my shoulder because his wife stays in the doctor's office all the time and has high medical bills and the doctor says, "Nothing is wrong with her. You need to get a job and get out and meet people and not have so much responsibility." But he doesn't want to hear that.

Let me put it together a little bit. We are led to believe that all men are supposed to be aggressive and ambitious, display great strength, and most of all, not show any signs of weakness. The converse is true for a woman. Of course, that assumes that all men are Atlas and all alike. And you know that's not so. But we allow men to make some choices and they make them according to their own physique, strength, ability, interests, concerns, and circumstances.

Women, too, are supposed to be all alike. In particular, they are not supposed to be aggressive, unless you bother their children or their husbands. The woman must not be ambitious because men don't like ambitious women who "act like men." That's a good put-down. We mean she's not supposed to be ambitious nor aggressive when it comes to getting training and jobs in competition. We begin whispering campaigns when a woman starts getting too much in competition, and the first question is whether she's "really all woman."

I'm still talking about a half of the population and its access to education, training, employment, and self-fulfillment, but I'm focusing on those things that keep coming into the picture, I can only say to women, "Get that training in advance, so that you can make choices." That's what it's all about, being equipped to make choices, because there's a big number of people who can't make any choice, even within the minority group.

Talking about Japanese as gardeners: I hope you never give it up. What I hope you will do is train more and make it big business. We're going to have to have gardeners. Why are you going to do it all you life and then give it up when it just begins to pay?

That's like household work. We used to do that stuff free all the time, for little or nothing. Now we're going to get paid for it and we're going to give it up to somebody else and they're going to get the big money. That doesn't make sense. Make a business of it and control it. Japanese gardening and Chinese laundries and Filipino house servants, and Blacks and all that stuff; whatever the stereotype is within the minority, we must think about where women fit in. You have women in education, but they don't get to be administrators. You have women in health fields, but they are the nurses. They've got a quota in medical schools—higher scores and higher requirements for women. The medical schools, the law schools, the engineering schools, all have had quotas for women all this time, and nobody ever said anything about it. The man head of the American Medical Association said on television, "We're going to raise the quota for women from nine to eleven percent." He said that out loud.

Somebody keeps on walking up to me and saying, "Mrs. Koontz, I really don't see why blacks are complaining. You came from the South and "you made it." I answer, "Yes, I'm that token. I was allowed up through the sieve." There's the star syndrome: "Why, sure, anybody with as much intelligence as I have and as much ambition can do the same because I made it on my own." Biggest lie ever told. Sets of circumstances have helped every one of us get wherever we think we are.

I'm not going to put down brain power, work, study, and degrees either. They all go into a part of the equipment. As long as the system calls for credentials and we don't have anything better to offer, we are going to have to get the credentials. But then we must be careful that we don't put down our brothers and sisters who don't have the credentials. We can get so far away from them that we can't even communicate with one of our own group.

None of the minority groups has enough people trained that we can afford to set aside a half of our groups and say, "That half shall not have the same equal opportunity as the other one because they are women."

It does not require the brawn for most jobs that once was required. Most jobs have been changed by technology. Yet I find that a lot of people want to "protect" women. We've talked to a lot of Congressmen and other legislators who say, "Mrs. Koontz, I just don't think women ought to do that kind of work," and I say, "Are you their fathers or their husbands? Are you willing to take them on and support them in the style you support your family?" Because what they are saying is that they don't want that for their wives and female relatives, and so they're going to legislate so that every woman must conform to what they think they ought to be.

But there are women on welfare because they cannot get a job paying enough to support their families, and women working for less than a minimum wage in most of the jobs they hold. We can't even get those jobs recognized on the minimum wage, but those women are supposed to go to work for 75 cents an hour and support their three or four kids rather than accept health care or accept decent housing.

We don't even know sometimes how the other half is living, right within our own groups. Let's not be guilty as middle-class minorities for saying, "All those other folk that haven't done it are just not willing to work." You need employment skills and work experience to be able to hold a job securely. For example, if you worked with getting jobs for the "hard core" and the next week after pay day, they don't go back, you may get mad. But if you check, you will find out they didn't have a way to get to work that next week, because the person they were riding with changed jobs. Without employment experience the individual does not know how to look out for alternative ways to get to work.

"Common sense" comes from experience, and we are going to have to teach that along with the occupational skills.

A minority is a group that is excluded from whatever others have access to, whether by geography, because of race, because of language, or because of size. It's only when you get excluded that it begins to matter and to hurt.

But we all have more in common than we have different. I hope that as we provide career education, we will look at this school system as it is now and see how it is excluding a half of the population from the chance to be trained and then to be able to make the choice. We can put it all together.

IV. MINORITY CAUCUSES

On Saturday, members and representatives of the minority caucuses, including the youth caucus, presented statements. Formal resolutions or position papers were later submitted by all the caucuses except for the Puerto Rican and youth caucuses. Conference participants voted that both the statements and the resolutions should appear in full in the final report of the conference. In the interest of brevity, however, the editors have summarized the statement of the youth caucus representative.

STATEMENTS OF MINORITY CAUCUSES

Saturday, February 3

Statement of Chinese-American Caucus

By Mr. Irving Sheu Kee Chin

Thank you. The Chinese American Caucus wishes to make its position known that the Chinese Americans have been traditionally people who are law-abiding and non-militant and have solved their problems individually.

We have been denied equal participation in the rights and privileges accorded other minority groups. In fact, a myth has evolved that Chinese Americans do not have problems; however, with the revision of the Immigration Law in 1965, Chinatowns are experiencing a heavy influx of Chinese immigrants to the extent that we are now experiencing problems of a social and economic nature.

Chinese American communities find themselves unable to handle problems which they had heretofore been able to do, and we need help. Therefore, we have come to the conclusion that first of all Chinese Americans, to rectify the inequities, should participate in all minority activities such that we resolve that in minority legislation hereafter the definition of "minority" shall include Orientals and that this be similar to that passed in Public Law 92-318 under the Educational Amendment of 1972.

And we further resolve that, in areas of career education, we endorse the concept of career education and we also resolve that in implementation of career education, the maximum utilization of Chinese Americans be implemented in terms of planning, development, funding, operation, and evaluation, so that they are actually geared and tailored to our needs and not to others' concepts of our needs.

And we also wish to make known that language training such as English, a second language, and bi-lingual training be implemented before career education or simultaneously with career education programs, since these are the basic needs of our communities. We cannot accomplish these career education programs without being able to communicate with the people who are receiving the benefits.

And we wish also to make known that the government, private industry, labor, and all agencies such as the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education hereafter should seek to employ and utilize highly qualified Chinese at policy and decision-making levels, so that we can participate meaningfully in every phase of American life, and we hope that we are able to contribute to the growth of America.

Statement of Japanese-American Caucus

By Mr. Ross Harano

Good morning, as they say in the Old Country.

I was born here. My name is Ross Harano and I am a volunteer worker within the Japanese American communtiy in Chicago and also an elected officer in the Japanese American Citizens League.

As Japanese Americans, we sense that in essence this conference has agreed that there must be minority ethnic input into the decision-making process of the career education program at all levels.

As Japanese Americans, we also sense that the success or failure of career education for ethnic minorities ultimately is in the hands of the guidance counselor and the teacher. We have alluded to the fact that they must be sensitive to the needs and aspirations and cultural backgrounds of ethnic minorities, but how do we sensitize guidance counselors and teachers to ethnic minorities?

Today, the standard method is that they take special courses *outside* of their own normal curriculum. Today, even special bus tours are given to them to visit us folks in our own communities. How can they be truly sensitive to the needs of ethnic minorities, when the overall system is one of institutional racism?

We believe that one of the basic factors contributing to the institutional racism is the concept of the Melting Pot. Under this theory, all of us would assimilate into the American mainstream. Remember this theory, on the Fourth of July, Henry Ford would have all of his workers, in their national clothing, walk up to this big pot and they would take off their outer garments and underneath would be the Henry Ford uniform signifying that they're melted into the mainstream, melted into the melting pot.

Even school children did this by walking through this pot with the national clothing on one side and the other side coming out in American clothing, carrying a flag.

The fallacy of this theory is that it does not recognize differences. In fact, under this theory, differences are bad. So if you are different, you have an accent, different color, you never can really assimilate, under this theory.

We as Japanese Americans believe that we must change the basic philosophy of this country in regards to the Melting Pot theory. We must change it to one that recognizes the multi-cultural factor in this country. It's diversity that made this country.

We must begin to rewrite American history as it really was and not as it was supposed to be. Why do we study American history in terms of wars: The Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Civil War, World War I, World War II — we almost won that one, by the way.

Now, you are trying to figure out who "we" are.

We believe that we should study American history in terms of the immigration process. Most Americans believe that no one came to this country after 1776. We see the dangers of this style of conference, in that each of the ethnic minority groups, Black, brown, red, yellow, anything, beige, has been forced to operate in a vacuum. We assume that we, as ethnic minorities, are sensitive to the needs of other ethnic minorities.

We cannot and should not view the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant society as a monolithic group, for within it are many ethnic groups: the Polish, the Italians, the Greeks, the Lithuanians, the Latvians, the Estonians, each with its own priorities, each with their own needs.

We must form coalitions within each of these ethnic groups along certain educational issues, rather than along color lines. The whole goal is quality education. We as Japanese Americans have seen racism in America at its peak when in 1942, 110,000 of us were evacuated into concentration camps. As one of the folks born in one of these camps in California, I am all too aware of what can happen if we do not deal with the basic issue of racism.

We believe that we as ethnic minorities must look into our own racism, our own stereotyping of other folks. If we are racists, how can we expect society as a whole not to be racists? We as Japanese Americans should not and will not be used as "Uncle Tom's," "Uncle Temoses" for other folks.

We have been pointed out as the most successful minority group in this country by others as a means of saying, "They made it; why can't you?"

As Japanese Americans, we refuse to be used in this manner and we will speak out against this tactic when it is being used.

Finally, it is the intent of the federal government to doom us to a minimum of four percent of the work force to be unemployed; if this is so, some alternatives must be considered to accommodate this plan of distribution of human resources.

Why not simply pay salaries for students to remain in the educational system past a certain minimum age? Delicately phrased, why not make available an educational stipend for students just for staying in an educational institution? Just think of the impact that would have on the 250,000 spin-outs if they did not spin? Just think of the number of teaching positions that would create. Just think what effect this would have on the present welfare system. Just think of the implications for minority students.

We believe that the success or failure of this conference will not be measured in terms of whether or not the term "career education" is ever defined or whether or not we get a Japanese American at every decision-making position.

We as Japanese Americans view this conference as a success because it brought you people, brothers and sisters, together. We as Japanese Americans believe that this is the first step, and the next step is up to you.

Statement of Chicano Caucus
By Autoni Eszuibel

Buenos aires, mucho gracias — that's the way we do say it in the Old Country, and I was born here. Thank you very much for the opportunity of speaking to the group here on the concerns of the Chicano Caucus. I have been very impressed and I am very happy as a singular person to have had access to the thinking of the Chinese American Caucus and the Japanese American Caucus so far. This is the first conference that I have been able to attend where we have these minorities represented, and I think — as we speak from our particular vantage points as minorities — I think we learn from each other.

As we separate and talk as separate entities through caucus groups, I would hope that we would not misinterpret that direction that we would follow as separatist directions, as it has been interpreted in some of our sectional meetings, because I think we are all together on this thing. More than anybody else, I would wish to recognize this.

We do wish to speak from the viewpoint of the second largest minority in the country — the first large minority or the largest minority in the Southwest, but the second in the nation. We feel that we have problems peculiar to the Chicano and for that reason, I do have an opening statement that was not written by me, it was written by another gentleman in the caucus, and then I would just like to speak from the outline form about some 21 resolutions that we have written. I don't wish to read them to you; I just want to talk from an outline form.

The opening statement that I wish to read for the record is as follows:

> If career education programs are an attempt to restructure curriculum in terms of knowledge of careers and human development, then the implications for the linguistically and culturally distinct in this country is that, traditionally, education has been directed at the middle-class and only to the English-speaking. If the educational system continues to ignore the special needs of the linguistically and culturally distinct, the only effect of new educational strategies — in this case, career education — will be to further lock these students into the cycle of poverty in which they were born.
>
> If languages other than English are ignored in the instructional process, then the linguistically and culturally different persons will continue to be sorted out and allocated into job classifications where manual rather than cognitive skills dominate.
>
> In order for career education to fulfill the potential of every student in a cultural democracy and preserve the right of every American person to remain identified with his own ethnic group, while learning the necessary skills to compete in the economic life of society, career education then must give immediate attention to the special needs of Chicanos and others who are linguistically and culturally distinct.
>
> In a recent address at New Mexico Highlands University, Assistant Secretary Sidney Marland, Jr., asserted, "It goes against the grain even in a child to be required to learn to read and then to read again that your forefathers were unimportant, that your customs and beliefs did not deserve attention from the majority culture, and that you likewise are destined to be a nobody with no cultural heritage of your own."
>
> This is precisely what the Chicano Caucus has seen in the development of career education.

That is a general statement that will introduce some 21 resolutions that the Chicanos will submit at a later time. I am going to try to highlight those resolutions now.

First of all, I feel that one very important fact to this conference is that which would provide that a "Mesa Directiva" be drafted or incorporated by either the Office of Education, the National Institute of Education, or a combination of both.

"Mesa Directiva' would be an advisory group that would be selected from the caucus that would be able to be called upon to interrelate or correlate or to continue the process of evolving the definition of career education and what the implications would be for the larger society as well as the Chicano society.

The "Mesa Directiva" is the number one priority our caucus has given this particular convention, and that is, unless we name a body from within the caucus groups, this convention would be just one more convention. We will all go home and forget that we ever attended it and forget what we have heard here.

We would like to make as very strong and number one suggestions: that we tie into an advisory "Mesa Directiva" from the various caucus groups; that the bi-lingual and bi-cultural curriculum be taken out of the demonstration area as it is in the law now, Demonstration Project, Title VII, and be incorporated as a true law and a commitment to multi-cultural, multi-lingual education; that legislation be effected and administrative guidelines be effected by the Office of Education and by the National Institute of Education; that position papers to the Office of Education and to the National Institute of Education be drafted by Chicanos in our particular thinking; that we name people, top-notch people of our own choosing to write position papers on career education and what those implications are for our group; that the curriculum be restructured to fit our cultural makeup and our historical development that would tell us really sincerely and truly that our parents and forefathers did not land on the Mayflower, but came from the South under a different bag. They came by way of the Rio Grande; they didn't come in a boat and the story that we have to tell from our vantage point is that our history and our culture is derived from the South, rather than from the North, to be relevant to the Mexican-American child.

We suggest further:

- That if revenue-sharing is to have its effect on education, that revenue-sharing very much be effected as far as the implications that hose monies would have on minorities as it would be effected at a local level, and that those effects would be incorporated into legislation, as it is not in general revenue-sharing legislation.
- That training programs of the type that would develop work skills be relegated as far as the Chicano to the program which we have already established nationally through the LULAK and the GI Forum, and that this operation be continued as it regards job skills and career education development for the Chicano.
- That a bi-lingual/bi-cultural clearinghouse be developed nationally, so that we would have continuing input into the various facets of career education as it regards bi-lingual and bi-cultural education. I have spoken before on testing, but I can't de-emphasize it at this point, an the Chicanos did accept that resolution also. That is that something should be done, if we are to look realistically at academia opening up its doors to minority Chicanos, and something should be done about the screening out process of the various testing programs that we have in college admissions, university admissions, and professional college admissions programs for testing devices.
- That vocational monies be directed to poor school districts that cannot raise their monies because of a low tax base, and that if any other conferences of this type are to be planned and to be evolved, that Chicanos be involved because we came to this conference feeling that none of us truly participated in its planning.

Statement of Black Caucus
By Dr. Ernest A. Dow

Good morning and thank you very much for providing us an opportunity to speak with you.

The Black Caucus approach was from several points of view: one, to let you know the context in which we view career education; secondly, to make a statement; and then to make nine suggestions and resolutions.

There have been several definitions offered of career education and education. Assistant Secretary of HEW, Dr. Sidney Mrland, Jr., has stated that helping people to find fulfillment is what education is all about.

The Assistant Secretary has said that the purposes of career education is to free Americans by preparing them to make intelligent career choices from the entire range of options, including a liberal arts degree for those who want it, as well as respectable skills or crafts for those who want that.

He has also said that continuing education for the adult population is another central purpose of the career education concept.

In this same speech, Secretary Marland defined career education as education that prepares one to think and to care about social responsibilities and personal intellectual fulfillment, but that education also equips all learners at whatever age with satisfying and rewarding competencies for entering the world of work in the field of one's choice.

The Secretary also pointed out that one of his predecessors, Commissioner of Education William T. Harris, was responsible for education in Alaska, but that educational needs of the Eskimos in the territory were over-shadowed, to say the least, by the fact that many of them were starving.

Futher, Augustus F. Hawkins, Congressman from the 21st District of California, stated very clearly an additional component that must become a part of career education:"While we can agree that work is a major component of a person's life, other parts are equally important and are an equal province of formal education. Unless career education helps to develop a true dimensional human being who has knowledge of and interest in his culture as well as the culture of others and the many heritages that make up the humanities, it will hve produced another robot in a materialistic society."

Moreover, we feel that one of the initial activities desirable in career education is that of needs' assessment. This assessment of needs is multi-faceted and should include the following:

1. Students in terms of their expressed need for information, preparation courses, and knowledge of career clusters.

2. Community — In terms of its perception of career education, resources available, and the availability of career opportunities.

3. Labor Market — In terms of employer's demands, expectations, and opportunities.

4. Staff — In terms of their understanding of career education, their willingness to participate, and their procedure roles in career education.

5. Curriculum — In terms of what is now being done to foster career development and potential for modified and new activities.

Assessment, as defined above, relates to a variety of needs, levels of understanding, and receptivity and a willingness to participate in career education. The assessing of such needs can be done on a formal or informal basis, but it should be formalized to the extent that valid and reliable data can be attained.

To assist in the assessing of needs, there are a variety of tests and instruments available.

With the aforementioned discussion, we have concluded that to strengthen and implement the concept of career education, the following points must be included:

1. From this point on, Black leaders are to be involved in the planning stage and decision and policy-making activities at all levels of implementation of career education concept and programs.

2. Blacks must be involved in decisions on the budget distribution of all funds appropriated for all career education programs. This includes federal, state, and local funds, revenue sharing, and public and private funds.

3. An informational system must be developed for sharing information concerning career education programs that are successful in meeting our needs.

4. Black advisory groups must be established without the usual ambiguity typical of advisory committees or councils. What we are saying is that Black advisory groups should also be involved in the councils.

5. The Office of Education must set up mandates at a state and local level to establish state and local councils.

6. In addition to the acquisition of basic skills that relate to particular job levels and the society in which we exist, career education must also involve the promotion and development of reading and those basic education skills that would enable Black people to become more aware of themselves and the society in which we exist.

7. There must be pre-service and in-service teacher training to include cross-cultural and/or multi-cultural factors. Also attitudinal changes must be considered.

8. A publicity system must be established to enable the man on the street to be aware and knowledgable of the career education concept and implications it has for his life and how it would affect him.

9. The Office of Education must establish a formal program through the Department of Labor to eliminate barriers established by unions and other organizations that prevent equal employment opportunities for all members of a society.

10. The Office of Education and National Institute of Education must immediately employ minorities — Blacks and others — in planning and policy-making in the development of the career education program.

Statement of Native American Caucus
By Ms. Ruth Corcoran

I just want to say that, referring back to the beginning where we are pluralistic and we have many differences, many similarities, in looking over this group, I guess I am impressed with some facts that you know, but which I would like to say.

Many of us have said that we felt neglected even at this conference and I think that there is justification of this from several of us. I feel this way and my group feels this way, but I think a couple of my observations need to be spoken, at least from my point of view.

I think we want to do something about this situation and perhaps the career education concept is a way of doing it, if we control it. What you people are saying to me is what I feel about myself.

Before anyone can be anyone, they must first of all have faith in themselves and this means that one must have a good personal image of oneself.

I have this and sometimes people accuse me of being proud. Well, I am, and I think you people are, too, and you should be. I was proud when I suddently discovered by coming to this conference that, for instance, William Young was the head of Project Unique out in Rochester. Would you believe I never connected him with this? So I was doubly proud to meet him. I agree with most of what he says and what he believes in, but we, too, have differences. So what? if we agreed about everything, we would never go forward, so your good self-image must be protected to the rest of your people, in whatever way you can do it.

I think the other thing that you have been saying here in many ways is as our other young friend said (you know, the young people have much to offer). The concept of minorities has always been monolithic and this is a word, I, too, have used. It's not so. We know it, but we must make the powers-that-be and others aware of it. I love to tell stories about my people, whether it's an ethnic joke, a legend, or what-have-you, and I am proud of these things. I don't care if someone else does it, if they understand the sense of humor and the rest, this is good.

Along this same line, Mel Patterson, who is one of our people from New York, a newspaper man, and a reporter. He did a lot of work with his people, and he said that he didn't want 100 percent education for his people (I am paraphrasing his words) — "I want 200 percent for my people. I want 100 percent of your education to put us in the mainstream, and I want the other 100 percent devoted to my cultural background."

Now, Dr. Dow has tried, I know, on at least two occasions, to have a coalition of minorities where they agree and support each other, and we should think more about this and seriously. If we go away from here with none of this implemented — and I challenged you and myself, as well — we are partly to blame. We cannot stop it here. If we want regional implementation, whatever follow-up we have in our resolutions, then we as individuals must make the effort to do it.

As one of our Asian Americans said, "Don't let the conference use you; you use this conference."

Statement of Puerto Rican Caucus
By Dr. Candido deLeon

We are going to have to come together to put together a position that is representative of the Puerto Rican Caucus. One of the situations that confronts us daily is that half of our people are on an island and the other half of the people are on the part that is called the Mainland, and being a Puerto Rican involves living in the tension that exists between these two extremities, so we will get together and put together a position that will be distributed to you, and share it with you so that you have a sense of the flavor of the position that will represent all of us and not just a few who are able to come here.

Statement of Youth Caucus
By Ms. Margarita Nogueras

Before I begin, I would first like to announce the names of members of the Yuth Caucus: Clifford D. Field, Hayward Hobson, Carol Smith, Frank Morano, Soleng Tom, John W. Banks, Stephanie Barber, and Jean Hopson.

No one at this conference has realized that the young people are a very, very big minority. But we have been generally ignored. We observed that the conference officials were planning and developing everything for the young people, without allowing youth into the policy making and planning of the conference. However, I do want to thank those on the committee who did, at least, invite the young people to be present (if only to take up space), and I want to personally thank Dr. Candido de Leon, who brought me to the conference to represent the youth.

The recommendation made by our Youth Caucus is that all policy-making commissions, federal, state, advisory, or executive, should involve students. In addition, a youth council should be set up specifically to deal with the planning and implementation of all career education programs involving youth. That council should be composed of young people from all ethnic backgrounds.

Another observation made by our people was that special interests of groups were overemphasized. There are common interests as well as differences. The planners of the conference should have done more to orient participants toward a feeling of togetherness rather than to emphasize competition. What has happened is that everyone is taking a peice of the pie for themselves, and that is, I think, unjust because it's going out in all unequal parts. We are not resolving any situations; we are making it worse.

We would like to let it be known that we, the youth, would like to have full representation in all aspects of career education program development, if the program intends to deal with all minorities.

Formal Resolutions/Position Papers from Minority Caucuses*

Formal Resolution: Chinese-American Caucus

Historically, Chinese-Americans have been a traditional people, conservative in outlook and law-abiding in nature. Because Chinese-Americans have abhorred militancy and advocated self-help, we have been denied equal participation in the rights and privileges accorded other minority groups. In fact, a myth has evolved that Chinese-Americans do not need help.

However, with the revision of the immigration law in 1965, Chinatowns are experiencing a heavy influx of Chinese immigrants, men, women, and children who do not know the language or understand the culture and who are completely cut off from the mainstream of American life. Chinese-American communities find themselves taxed beyond their capacity to help their own. Chinese-American communities need help.

WHEREAS, Chinese-Americans have historically been responsible citizens who have by tradition been law abiding in nature and who have abhorred militancy while following a non-violent approach in solving our problems through self reliance, and

WHEREAS, a heavy influx of Chinese immigrants have resulted from the revision of the immigration laws of 1965, and

WHEREAS, these new immigrants, because of language barriers in English and a lack of familiarity with American customs and culture, are compelled to congregate in Chinatown communities, thereby cutting themselves off from the American mainstream; and

WHEREAS, this heavy concentration of Chinese young and old has caused a multiplicity of new social, economic and cultural problems far beyond the capabilities of the Chinese-American community to resolve independently, as it previously could accomplish,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Chinese-American Caucus of the National Conference of Career Education, Implications for Minorities, request that all future minority legislation in every area shall statutorily define "MINORITY" to include "ORIENTAL," similar to that found in Public Law 92-318 passed by the 92nd Congress on June 23, 1972 as "Education Amendments of 1972"; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chinese-Americans support the concept of CAREER EDUCATION and the objectives and goals it seeks to achieve; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that to insure the successful operation of career education, we deem it essential that the maximum use of qualified Chinese-American personnel be utilized at every level of decision-making positions, including but not limited to planning, development, operation, administration, funding and evaluation of said career education programs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that career education programs shall include "English As A Second Language," bilingual and bicultural programs, so that Chinese having English language and cultural barriers will maximize their potential in availing themselves of career education opportunities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that programs to train bilingual Chinese in health, technical, and social services skills be implemented through scholarship and funding to meet the Chinese-American community needs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that training programs be established in business and industry where Chinese may become career education candidates; and

BE IT RESOLVED that we encourage equal employment opportunity for the hiring and utilization of Chinese-Americans in all high-level policy and decision-making echelons in government.

---

* Submitted after the Conference.

private industry, and labor, including the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education, for example, to open job opportunities to those qualified who can contribute their services to the continued growth of America.

February3, 1973, Washington, D.C.
Conference on Career Education: Implications for Minorities

Julie Chang Bloch
Agnes I. Chan
Paul Chan (Rev.)
Lily Lee Chen
Anna Chennault
Irving S.K. Chin
George Y. Chinn
Doreen Y.H. Feng
Louis Hong
Jeanie Fong Jew
William Chin Lee
Walter Ong
Francis Shieh
Soleng Tom
John B. Tsu
Pauline Tsui
T.L. Tsui
Kung Lee Wang
Gwendolyn Wong

Respectfully submitted by,

Doreen Yen Hung Feng

Formal Resolutions and Recommendations: Japanese-American Caucus

WHEREAS, certain individual members of the Japanese American Caucus have expressed serious reservations about the general concept fo "career education;"

WHEREAS, all members of the Japanese Ameircan Caucus have expressed concern that the improper or insensitive implementation of a career education program can potentially result in the channelling or tracking of minority students, according to the stereotypic views of the majority society;

WHEREAS, many Asian American students are presently tracked or channeled into certain occupations and professions, because of the stereotypes which are held by many professionals in the educational system;

WHEREAS, the channelling or tracking of minority students according to stereotypes denies those students the opportunity to consider the full range of career choices and furthers the racist structure of society;

WHEREAS, the members of the Japanese American Caucus recognize that career education will be implemented in spite of the reservations which we have with regard to the general concept, and therefore that the only way to prevent and protect the abuse of minority students is through active participation by the minority communities in planning and implementation of career education;

WHEREAS, some Asian American ethnic communities were not represented at the conference;

WHEREAS, the Japanese American Caucus believes that all minority communities share certain basic problems and concerns in the area of education, but that in addition each of the individual minority communities also have problems which are of particular concern to them;

WHEREAS, Asian Americans in the past have not been considered as a minority group and thus have been denied certain rights and privileges extended to other minority groups

NOW THEREFORE, the Japanese American Caucus revolves and recommends as follows:

RESOLVED AND RECOMMENDED that in order to make career education a truly effective program for Asian Americans, it is imperative that all minorities be placed at all levels of decision making in all federal, state and local programs dealing with career education;

FURTHER RESOLVED AND RECOMMENDED that all educators, counselors, and administrators involved in the career education process be extensively retrained to sensitize them to the special needs and concerns of Asian American students;

FURTHER RESOLVED AND RECOMMENDED that a special affirmative effort must be made at all levels of government and to hire more Asian Americans as educators, administrators, and counselors;

FURTHER RESOLVED AND RECOMMENDED that formal mechanisms must be immediately established to ensure that representatives of the Asian American community will serve in an advisory capacity at the federal, state, and local levels;

FURTHER RESOLVED AND RECOMMENDED that the special language problems of some Asian American students be recognized by the career education program, and that specific programs be established to deal with the problems of students for whom English is a second language;

FURTHER RESOLVED AND RECOMMENDED that Asian American be recognized as a minority group, and that they be extended the same concern and treatment as the other minority groups participating in this conference;

FURTHER RESOLVED AND RECOMMENDED that formal equal opportunity guidelines be promulgated by the Office of Education and any other agency administering the career education program to ensure that minority groups are provided equal opportunities in the career education program;

FURTHER RESOLVED AND RECOMMENDED that students from poor and low income families be provided with special stipends and allowances, so that they will not be denied equal educational opportunities because of their economic status;

FURTHER RESOLVED AND RECOMMENDED that the Asian American ethnic group which were not adequately represented at this conference should be given an opportunity to express their opinions and concerns as soon as possible;

FURTHER RESOLVED AND RECOMMENDED that the federal, state, and local governments combine their effort in careeer education with affirmative efforts in other programs and areas to reduce racial discrimination in American society.

Submitted by
the Japanese American Caucus
National Conference on Career
Education: Implications for Minorities

Barry D. Matsumoto,
Reporter for the Caucus

Formal Resolution: Chicano Caucus

Introduction

In order for career education to fulfill the potential of every student in a cultural democracy and preserve the right of every American person to remain identified with his own ethnic group, while learning the necessary skills to compete in the economic life of society, career education must give immediate attention to the special needs of Chicanos and others that are linguistically and culturally distinct.

In a recent address at New Mexico Highlands University, June 1972, the Assistant Secretary, Sidney Marland, Jr., asserted that:

> It goes against the grain, even in a child, to be required to learn to *read* — and then to *read* that your forefathers were unimportant, that their customs and beliefs did not deserve attention from the majority culture — and that *you likewise* are destined to be nobody with no cultural heritage of your own. This is precisely what the Chicano Caucus has seen in the development of career education.

If career education programs are an attempt to restructure currriculum in terms of knowledge of careers and human development, then the implications for the linguistically and culturally distinct in this country must be taken into account.

One of the great problems facing the linguistically and culturally distinct in this country is that, traditionally, education has been directed primarily at the middle class and only to the English speaking.

If the educational system continues to ignore the special needs of the linguistically and culturally distinct, the only effect of new educational strategies, in this case, career education, will be to further lock these students into the cycle of poverty in which they were born.

If languages other than English are ignored in the instructional process, then linguistically and culturally different persons will continually be sorted out and allocated into job classifications where manual rather than cognitive skills dominate.

Resolution #1

Be it resolved that a "MESA DIRECTIVA"* be established and composed of Spanish-speaking individuals knowledgeable in the area of education and cognizant of the needs of the Spanish-speaking communities. The "MESA DIRECTIVA" must be officially approved and recognized as a legitimate representative body by Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Education; Thomas Glennan, Director, National Institute for Education; and Dr. John Ottina, United States Commissioner of Education, to function as an advisory body to reflect the needs and aspirations of the Chicano. The "MESA DIRECTIVA" must be delegated the authority to review career education programs for funding to insure relevancy, proper curriculum content and adequate and reflective administrative personnel. The "MESA DIRECTIVA" will be responsible for reviewing legislative guidelines and monies earmarked for revenue sharing. The "MESA DIRECTIVA" will solicit position papers on career education from Chicano educators and community people to aid the Education Division of HEW in the development of Career Education. It is recommended that the "MESA DIRECTIVA" meet quarterly and that all costs, including the contracting of position papers, be the responsibility of Dr. Sidney Marland, Dr. Thomas Glennan and Dr. John Ottima.

Resolution #2

Be its resolved that language be introduced into the career education bill and/or administrating regulated guidelines presently being prepared by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, the guidelines should make provisions for the inclusions of bilingual, bicultural education into all phases of the proposed career education program.

---

*The following persons are willing to participate in the "MESA DIRECTIVA": Pepe Barron, Washington, D.C.; Tony Calvo, California; Alfredo de los Santos, Texas; Antonio Esquibel, Colorado; Corrine Sanchez, California; Gilbert de los Santos, Texas; Joe Bernal, Texas; and Anita Pando, Utah

Resolution #3

Be it resolved that programs for preparing Chicanos adequately as career education specialists, i.e., counselors, administrators, faculty, program directors, etc., be developed, executed and maintained. This type of effort should compensate for the loss of Chicano human potential. Also, that assertive training programs be established immediately for upgrading the Chicana in their present situation as factory workers, secretaries, and welfare recipients.

Resolution #4

Be it resolved that the Office of Education contract Chicanos for writing position papers on "Implications of Career Education for Chicanos."

Resolution #5

Be it resolved that a national clearing house for information exchange on Chicano resource personnel, materials, and programs be organized by Chicanos. The efforts should be funded by the Office of Education and N.I.E. A national clearing house would promote communication among Chicanos and the U.S. Office of Education.

Resolution #6

Be it resolved that career education incorporate monies to upgrade vocational training in poor school districts. Because of their limited local base, poor districts have had the problem of not having sufficient funds.

Resolution #7

Be it resolved that more visibility and financial assistance be provided for the only Chicano, Spanish-speaking manpower training program, SER (Service, Employment and Redevelopment), in order to improve and augment the services so critically needed in many parts of this country where large pockets of Spanish-speaking populations reside.

Resolution #8

Be it resolved that future conferences with implications for minorities include a proportionate balanced representation of Chicanos in the planning of future conferences.

Resolution #9

Be it resolved that supportive services — e.g., day care, tutorial, counseling — be meaningfully adopted within the objectives of career education, which should enable Chicanas to partake of career education opportunities.

Resolution #10

Be it resolved that a Chicano marshalling device be implemented to insure the participation of Chicanos at the local level in the utilization of funds for career education allocated through revenue sharing.

Resolution #11

Be it resolved that career education be directed to incorporate innovative entrance procedures which would not screen out Chicanos by means of the MCAT (Medical College Admission Test), DCAT (Dental), LSAT (Lawyers), SAT, ACT, and GRE. Chicanos' enrollment in colleges and universitites reflect a minimal percentage of the Chicano population. Chicano professionals who would be culturally oriented to that community would enhance life in the *barrios*. We recognize that I.Q. testing has stereotyped Chicanos and has forced them into educational tracks which "locks" them into manual job constraints. At a later stage in life, the aforementioned professional schools screening tests further limits Chicano career options.

Resolution #12

Be it resolved that NIE and U.S.O.E. allow contracts for Chicano models to be developed which will address themselves to the unique needs of the bilingual, bicultural student in career education. Also, that any further developmental efforts in career education models include bilingual, bicultural concepts and curriculums that are directed toward the distinctive special needs of Chicanos.

Resolution # 13

Be it resolved that the current Commissioner of Education, Assistant Secretary for Education, insure that the Washington staff of the Office of Educaton and the National Institute of Education reflect the Chicano make-up of the U.S. population as President Nixon recommends in his 16-point program.

Resolution #14

Be it resolved that the Commissioner of Education insure that the regional Offices of Education and National Institute of Education staff reflect the Chicano make-up of those regions.

Resolution #15

Be it resolved that members of the "MESA DIRECTIVA" act as technical assistants to educational institutions which are developing career education ladders, and are in the Chicano regions of the country.

Resolution #16

Be it resolved that the "MESA DIRECTIVA" be responsible for coordinating and conducting regional workshops in the Chicano areas of the United States. The regional workshops will address themselves to the unique needs of the bilingual, bicultural student.

Resolution #17

And be it further resolved that rather than the current emphasis in developing curriculum materials which stress the white, Anglo, Protestant, and middle-class orientation, a new direction be taken which places the emphasis on meeting the individual needs of Chicano students — including differences among ethnic groups. And that in the curriculum and guidance aspects of career education, testing, counseling and decision-making instruments and practices be re-directed away from creating obstacles and barriers, as these have been used in the past — preventing the Chicano's attainment of his/her career goals.

Formal Resolution: Black Caucus

There have been several definitions offered of education and career education. Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Dr. Sidney Marland, Jr. has stated that "helping people find fulfillment is what education is all about."*

The Secretary has said that the purpose of career education "is to free Americans by preparing them to make intelligent career choices from the entire range of options, including the liberal arts degree for those who want it as well as the respectable skill or craft for those who want it.**

He has also said that, "Continuing education for the adult population is another central purpose of the career education concept."* In this same speech Secretary Marland defined career education as "—education that prepares one to think and to care about social responsibility and personal intellectual fulfillment, but education that also equips all learners, at whatever age, with satisfying and rewarding competencies for entering the world of work in the field on one's choice"*

The Secretary (Commissioner) also pointed out that one of his predecessors — Commissioner of Education William Torrey Harris—"was responsible for education in Alaska, but the educational needs of the Eskimos in the territory were overshadowed to say the least, by the fact that many of them were starving."*

Further, Augustus F. Hawkins, Congressman from the 21st District of Columbia stated very clearly an additional component that must become a part of career education:

> While we can agree that work is a major component of a person's life, other parts are equally important and are equally the province of formal education. Unless career education helps to develop a three-dimensional human being who has knowledge of and interest in his culture as well as the cultures of others and the many heritages that make up the humanities, it will have produced another robot in a materialistic society. Moreover we feel that one of the initial activities desirable in career education is that of needs assessment.

This assessment of needs is multi-faced and should include the following:

1. Students — In terms of career development, expressed needs for information and preparation courses, and knowledge of career clusters.
2. Community — In terms of perceptions of career education, resources available, and availability of career training opportunities.
3. Staff — In terms of their understanding of career education, their willingness to participate, and their perceived roles in career education.

---

*"Career Education and Community College Leadership, by S. P. Marland, Jr., April 8, 1972.

**Dallas Speech, February 28, 1972.

4. Labor Market — In terms of employer demands, expectations, and opportunities.
5. Curriculum — In terms of what is now being done to foster career development and potential for modified and new activities.

Assessments as defined above relate to a variety of needs, levels of understanding and receptivity, and willingness to participate in career education. The assessing of such needs can be done on a formal or informal basis, but it should be formalized to the extent that valid and reliable data can be obtained.

To assist in the assessing of needs, there are a variety of tests and instruments available.

With the forementioned discussion, we have concluded that to strengthen and implement the concept of career education, the following nine points must be included:

1. From this point on Black leaders are to be involved in the planning stage, and decision and policy making activities at all levels of implementation of the career education concept and program.
2. Blacks are to be involved in the budgetary distribution of all funds appropriated for all career education programs. This includes federal, state and local funds, revenue sharing, public and private funds.
3. Blacks should develop a means of shared information — in the form of informational systems — concerning programs that are successful in career education.
4. Black advisory groups be established without the usual ambiguity of typical advisory committees or councils.
5. O.E. must set up mandates at the state and local levels to establish state and local — preferably state advisory councils.
6. From the acquisition of basic skills that relate to particular job levels, to higher level concepts of analysis, synthesis and evaluation, which could enable our Black population to become much more critically aware of themselves and the society in which we exist, in order to enter the process of transforming that society. (Career education must be a vehicle that involves the promotion and development of reading and basic education skills.)
7. There must be pre-service and in-service training to include cross-cultural and/or multi-cultural factors —ATTITUDINAL CHANGE — must be considered.
8. A publicity system must be established to enable the man on the street to be aware and knowledgeable of the career education concept and existing (or future) programs and their implications in his life and how they affect him.

RESOLUTION

- That O.E. have a Career Educational Affirmative Action Program through DOL to eliminate barriers established by union organizations that prevent equal employment opportunities for all members of our society.
- That the Office of Education and National Institute of Education immediately employ minorities (Blacks) in planning and policy making positions in the Career Education Development Program.

Formal Resolutions: Native-American Caucus

1. While we do not purport to speak for all the American Indian population, the American Indian Caucus attending the National Conference on Career Education hereby supports the concept of career education, provided that the concept recognizes and includes the cultural values and the career opportunities pertaining to the American Indian; and, being that there is a necessity for greater input by the various American Indian tribes, we further recommend, as an extension of this conference, that regional meetings be held to provide fuller participation with the local groups, and if possible, that a coordinating committee representing all groups be appointed at this conference: and we further recommend that the use of the word "minority" in this type of conference be eliminated and that specific groups be named: i.e., American Indian, Blacks, Chicano, Chinese, Japanese, Puerto Rican.

2. WHEREAS, American Indians are a minoirty group at this national conference; and
WHEREAS, there should be equitable and meaningful representation and participation at a national conference, and,
WHEREAS, there should be equitable and meaningful representation and participation at a national conference, and,
WHEREAS, there has been a lack of this type of representation at the Career Education Conference in Washington, D.C.:
WHEREAS, we the American Indian Caucus group at this conference recognize and strongly urges that full consideration be given to this resolution:
BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that future conferences — national and otherwise — involving American Indians contact all tribal councils and/or tribal organizations of Indian reservations or Indian communities and recognized urban American Indian organizations [asking them] to recommend persons with the expertise and leadership qualities who could best represent American Indians.

V. CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions and recommendations were introduced at the "National Conference on Career Education: Implications for Minorities." These items emanated from the minority group caucuses and the small group sessions on Friday and Saturday morning.

Because many of the resolutions and recommendations were repetitive and over-lapping, the editors have attempted to consolidate them, and eliminate duplications. However, none were eliminated arbitrarily. Therefore, the following listings represent a compilation of the views expressed by the various individuals and groups.

RESOLUTIONS (COMPENDIUM)

WHEREAS the concept of career education has evolved from a national commitment; and has more than justified its continued development; and

WHEREAS the Administration has supported this concept thru tapping existing authorization for other educational programs, resulting in a weakening on those programs; and

WHEREAS the current impoundment of funds affecting education across the board further weakens career education thru the elimination of its additional sources of funding; and

WHEREAS, along with other things, career education cannot be complete without:

- Bi-lingual and bi-cultural development
- Elimination of tracking and its related fears
- Career education meeting the tests on job placement at the end.

AND WHEREAS minorities have recognized the failure of state and local officials to carry out the legislated responsibilities of meeting their particular needs:

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED:

- That the Admininstration commit new funds to support its policy of career education, thereby eliminating the need to strip existing programs of their authorizations.
- That existing laws be reviewed in terms of strengthening these programs to meet the needs of career education.
- That existing statutes be amended where appropriate to enhance the development of career education.
- That existing statutes should be further amended to contain a provision providing the use of special revenue sharing for present and further funding of education programs.
- That existing laws and guidelines be reviewed to determine the cause of failure to correct discrimination and the absence of equal educational opportunity.
- That incentives be developed as an instrument to be used to obtain equal educational opportunities;

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that one of the steps toward implementing the above defined goals be the legislating of a definition of career education to include the redefining of "Implications ofCareer Education for Minorities."

WHEREAS the Administration's attitude toward advisory councils to career education is not clear:

BE IT RESOLVED that career education legislation and guidelines mandate such councils at the local, state, and federal levels.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that such councils include organized labor, management, educators, and the community.

WHEREAS career education is seen as the vehicle to revamp the education system and as the labor constituency is vital in this concern:

BE IT RESOLVED that this effort must be a joint venture that includes labor, management, educators, and community in designing and molding the education system.

WHEREAS career education strikes at society's perceptions (or misperceptions) as to the value of an occupation:

> BE IT RESOLVED that one of the objectives of career education *must* be to raise the level, value, and dignity of all work.
>
> AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an immediate first step would be that in any further conferences, the title "Dr." be eliminated.

WHEREAS we support the need for government to make a maximum investment in all education and we support categorical aid appropriations resulting from the identification of needs by the Congress (ESEA Act and the Vocation and Education Act):

> BE IT RESOLVED that we oppose special revenue sharing and revenue sharing concept because no new money is being offered through this process to states to solve major problems in American education, and
>
> BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in order to bring minority participation into the World of Work, machinery must be developed that includes equal responsibility and representation from all parties (education, labor, management, government, and community).

WHEREAS, today's educational system has been proven inadequate to meet present day needs, and

WHEREAS, cultural and lingual sensitivity at the college teacher training level is lacking, and

WHEREAS, the new concept is to tailor the school curriculum to fit the individual's future career, and

WHEREAS, the teaching staff is not oriented to this concept:

> BE IT RESOLVED that the "National Conference on Career Education: Implications for Minorities," meeting at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 1-3, 1973, hereby recommend that the scope of teacher education be enlarged and emphasis be placed on graduate teacher training and that teachers be required to take cultural sensitivity and lingual courses, as well as courses in specialized fields with requirements to work for a specified time in that field, and
>
> BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that new legislation be passed in Congress to pay for such additional training.

WHEREAS, the Vocational Education Amendment of 1968 provides for evaluation of vocational education by advisory councils on both the state and national level, and

WHEREAS, the state and national councils are required by law to have representatives of a variety of groups, and

WHEREAS, the national council is appointed by a non-educator, the President of the United States, and

WHEREAS, it would be inappropriate for the Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education or the Commissioner of Education to appoint a committee to evaluate their own activities:

> BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the President retain the initiative and responsibility to appoint members to the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education and that the government retain its responsibilities as described under the Vocational Amendment of 1968.

WHEREAS, the members of the steering committee have gained valuable knowledge and insight into the problems and concerns of minorities and career education, and

WHEREAS, that knowledge and insight could be used to plan future conferences:

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this steering committee be designated to make initial planning for regional conferences in each of the regions during the months ahead.

RECOMMENDATIONS (COMPENDIUM)

- We (management session participants) neither endorse nor take a position against the career education concept. At this point, there are too many unknown variables for us to take a definitive position either for or against. However, should a career education program become a likely possibility, we strongly recommend that there be a continuous contact between the Office of Education and representatives of labor and management. In the final analysis we—both labor and management—are the end products of the educational system. Therefore, we strongly urge that labor and management be a part of developing any system, whether career education or any other, in order that we might give our input and thus assist education to produce the best possible product. Certainly a vehicle for such input can be, and we so recommend, a strong national advisory committee, as well as state advisory committees, with both groups containing broad representation from all of the minority groups—the young, females, labor, and management and other appropriate groups.

- All policy making commissions, federal or state, whether advisory committees or executive committees, should involve students. Students should be included in any evaluation of career education models.

- Information systems should be developed for the benefit of students.

- Career education guidelines should be written to allow for funding bi-lingual and bi-cultural programs.

- Programs funded for career education should recognize and be sensitive to the multi-cultural and ethnic diversities that deserve attention in the design and in the implementation of programs.

- We, the youth, would like to have full representation of youth if this career education program is to deal with all minorities.

- Recognizing how small the "pie" is and who is doing the dividing, it must be taken into consideration that the long-range career needs or the immediate job needs and all other personal/social needs of the citizen must be met on a day-to-day basis. Career education should not be divorced from other social needs (health, child care, transportation, etc.) in developing the total person for decent living.

- All teachers and all personnel involved in career education should be educated as to the objectives of the career education program.

- An advisory committee should be formulated from industry, business, and labor to work with universities to solve problems relative to placement of students.

- Each state should be given a mandate to form a committee to oversee all the functions of program, structure, and hiring, in order that programs may carry out objectives of career education.

- A 1202 committee should serve as a watchdog to see that career education funds are properly spent.

- The Office of Education should look at the guidelines of the 1202 Commission to determine if conflicts exist with state laws. Such conflicts should be resolved in order that the program may operate effectively at the state levels.

- The 1202 Commission composition should be appropriately represented within every state, making sure that the 1202 Commissions enforce those laws relative to career education.

- Monies must be equitably appropriated, so that the cost of taking a course at any school would be the same, whether at university or community college level.

- Programs funded for career education should recognize and be sensitive to the multi-cultural and ethnic diversities that deserve attention in the design and implementation of programs in career education.

- Existing committees involved in career education should be strengthened and utilized as opposed to creating new committees.

- The development of the concept of career education requires strong inputs from ethnic and minority groups on a community and local level.

- The current term "career education: K-12" should be expanded to institute the concept of "Career Education: Birth to Turf."

- Information on career education appropriations and subsequent use should be disseminated to the public. Major public relation programs to transmit the concept of career education through the utilization of various communication media should be carried out.

- Teams including teachers, counselors, principals, administrators, and vocational educators should be established to promote career education. Such teams should make clear the delinations between vocational education and career education.

- The symbols for clusters on career education publications (DHEW Publ. No. (OE) 73-00501, *et al*), using human figures perpetuate sexual stereotyping, should be revised.

- NIE should evaluate the Ohio State Model as to the surveys made, number of minorities on staff, and sub-contracts with minority businesses.

- A survey of career education models in each state should be performed for the information of NIE. The results of such surveys should also be shared with people on the local level.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

AGENDA

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CAREER EDUCATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR MINORITIES

FEBRUARY 1—3, 1973

Sheraton Park Hotel
Washington, D.C.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1973

8:00 a.m. **REGISTRATION** (Upper Concourse)

9:00 a.m. **GENERAL SESSION** (North Cotillion Room)

Presiding:	Mr. Reginald Petty Chairman Conference Steering Committee
Welcome:	Dr. Hugh Scott Superintendent of Schools District of Columbia
Introduction of Sponsors by:	Dr. Ermon Hogan National Director of Education National Urban League

Sponsors:

Dr. Calvin Dellefield
Executive Director
National Advisory Council
on Vocational Education

Dr. T. Edward Hollander
Deputy Commissioner on Higher Education
New York State Education Department

Mr. Peter P. Muirhead
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Education
Department of Health, Education & Welfare

Mr. John C. Pittenger
Secretary of Education
Pennsylvania State Department of Education

Introduction of the Project Officer:

Mr. William C. Young
Special Assistant to the Deputy Commissioner
Bureau of Occupational & Adult Education
Conference Project Officer

Introduction of Speaker by:	Mr. Ulyssese Byas President National Alliance of Black Superintendents of Schools

Speaker: Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr.
Assistant Secretary for Education
Department of Health, Education & Welfare

Conference Orientation: Dr. Robert (Kelly) Acosta
First Vice-Chairman
Conference Steering Committee

10:45 a.m. **COFFEE BREAK**

11:00 a.m. **GENERAL SESSION** (North Cotillion Room)

Presiding: Mr. Reginald Petty

Panel: *Implications of Career Education for Various Minority Groups*

Moderator: Dr. Candido de Leon
President
Hostas Community College
Bronx, New York

Panel Members:

Dr. Bernard Watson—*Implications of Career education for Blacks*
Ms. Ruth Corcoran—*Implications of Career Education for Native Americans*
Dr. Donicio Moralez—*Implications of Career Education for Chicanos*
Hon. Robert Garcia—*Implications of Career Education for Puerto Ricans*
Mr. Irving Sheu Kee Chin—*Implications of Career Education for Chinese*
Mr. Todd Endo—*Implications for Career Education for Japanese*

12:00 Noon **LUNCH** (South Cotillion Room)

Presiding: Mr. Reginald Petty

Introduction of Speaker: Mr. Irving Sheu Kee Chin
Commissioner
Human Rights Commission
New York City

Speaker: Hon. Shirley Chisholm
Democrat, 12th District
New York

2:30 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION** (North Cotillion Room)

Presiding: Mr. Reginald Petty

The Role of the National Institute of Education (NIE) in Career Education Mr. Thomas Glennan
Director
National Institute of Education

3:00 p.m.
The Role of the Office of Education (OE) in Career Education Dr.John Ottina
Acting Commissioner of
U.S. Office of Education

3:30 p.m. **COFFEE BREAK**

3:45 p.m. **IN-DEPTH DISCUSSION ON CAREER EDUCATION MODELS AND PROGRAMS**

Session I (North Cotillion Room): *The School-Based Model*

Chairman:	Ms. Carol Gibson Associate Director Ed. Policy Information Center National Urban League
Reporter:	Ms. Mari Luci Jaramillo University of New Mexico
Resource Person:	Dr. David Hampson National Institute of Education

Session II (South Cotillion Room): *The Employer-Based Model*

Chairman:	Dr. Delano Lewis General Public Affairs Manager C&P Telephone
Reporter:	Ms. Dinorah Rudolph Program Director IBERO American League
Resource Person:	Mr. Bernard Yabroff National Institute of Education

Session III (Continental Room): *The Home/Community Based Model*

Chairman:	Dr. Halbert Crowder Director of Development Daniel Payne College
Reporter:	Ms. Corrine Sanchez San Fernando, California
Resource Person:	Ms. Ella Johnston National Institute of Education

Session IV (Woodley Room): *The Rural Residential Model*

Chairman:	Dr. Xavier Mena Deputy Director Job Corps
Reporter:	Ms. Cathie Weeks Ononadaga-Seneca Tribe
Resource Persons:	Dr. Harold Johnson, and Dr. Thomas Moorefield National Institute of Education

Session V (Annapolis Room): *Model Building (Mini-Models)*

Chairman:	Dr. Russell A. Jackson, Jr. Superintendent of Schools Phoenix, Arizona
Reporter:	Ms. Julia Change Bloch Legislative Assistant to Sen. Charles Percy (R.-Ill)
Resource Persons:	Dr. Sidney High U.S. Office of Education Mr. Soleng Tom Tuscon Board of Education

Session VI (Potomac Room): *Curriculum Development*

Chairman:	Mr. Andrew Goodrich Director of Minority Group Programs American Association of Junior Colleges
Reporter:	Gov. Overton James Director of Indian Education Oklahoma State Education Department
Resource Person:	Dr. Elizabeth Simpson U.S. Office of Education

Session VII (Calvert Room): *Pre-Service and In-Service Teacher Education*

Chairman:	Dr. Barbara Hatten Stanford University
Reporter:	Dr. Melvin Sikes University of Texas
Resource Person:	Dr. Paul Manchak Office of Education

Session VIII (Taft Room): *Career Education Information Dissemination*

Chairman:	Ms. Lily Lee Chen Director of Services Planning Los Angeles County Welfare Department
Reporter:	Mr. John Hines President New Dimension Publications
Resource Persons:	Dr. Lee Burchinal National Institute of Education Dr. Duane Nielsen U.S. Office of Education

Session IX (Baltimore Room): *Urban Education Career Education Center/OIC*

Chairman:	Mr. Herman Coleman Associate Executive Secretary Michigan Education Association
Reporter:	Dr. Solomon Flores Director, Programs for the Spanish Speaking Chicago State University
Resource Person:	Dr. Howard Matthews Office of Education

4:45 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION** (North Cotillion Room)

Presiding:	Mr. Reginald Petty
Panel:	*Funding Career Education (State and Federal): Where Do the Funds Come From?*
Moderator:	Mr. Lapolis Ashford Urban Education Division National Urban Coalition
Federal:	Dr. William F. Pierce Deputy Commissioner Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education U.S. Office of Education
State-New Jersey:	Mr. Robert H. Areuts Supervising Consultant for Career Education New Jersey State Education Department
State-California:	Ms. Mary Aravale Career Education Task Force California State Department of Education

5:45 p.m. **CLOSING REMARKS**

6:30 p.m. **RECEPTION** (South Cotillion Room)

8:00 p.m. CAUCUSES: Groups wishing to caucus were directed to the following rooms:

Black Caucus	G-100 Room
Chicano Caucus	Taft Room
Puerto Rican Caucus	Woodley Room
Native American Caucus	Vinson Room
Chinese Caucus	Senate Room
Japanese Caucus	Wardman Room

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1973

9:00 a.m. **GENERAL SESSION** (Baltimore Annapolis Room)

Presiding: Mr. Reginald Petty

Panel: *Positions and Issues on Career Education*

Moderator: Dr. Lawrence Davenport
Vice President for
Development
Tuskegee Institute

10:45 a.m. **CONFERENCE ORIENTATION** Dr. Robert (Kelly) Acosta

10:45 a.m. **COFFEE BREAK**

11:05 a.m. **QUESTION SESSION**

Panel members were joined by Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Mr. Peter Muirhead, Dr. John Ottina, and Dr. Thomas Glennan

12:00 Noon **LUNCHEON** (Virginia Suite)

Presiding: Mr. Reginald Petty

Legislative Strategy and Future Plans for Career Education

Hon. Augustus Hawkins
(D. 21st Dist.—Calif)

Hon. William A. Steiger
(R. 6th District Wisconsin)

2:00 p.m. **REACTION SESSIONS** (Wilmington Room)

Session I (Wilmington Room)

Leader: Ms. Patsy Fleming
Legislative Assistant to
Rep. Augustus Hawkins
(D.—Calif.)

Reporter: Mr. Rafael Perez
Council Studies Ed. Corp.
Buffalo, New York

Resource Persons: Dr. Sidney High
OE

Dr. David Hampson
NIE

Session II (Annapolis Room)

Leader: Mr. David Ushio
Executive Director
Japanese-American Citizens
League

Reporter:	Ms. Margaret Walker Adult Education Georgia State Dept. of Education
Resource Persons:	Mr. Leroy Cornelsen Office of Education
	Mr. Bernard Yabroff NIE
Session III (Calvert Room):	
Leader:	Hon. Joe J. Bernal State Senator Texas
Reporter:	Ms. Arleen Winfield Women's Bureau Department of Labor
Resource Persons:	Mr. Michael Russo Office of Education
	Ms. Ella Johnston NIE
Session IV (Warren Room):	
Leader:	Mr. Vincent Serrana Kansas State Department of Education
Reporter:	Ms. Carolyn Parker Executive Director D.C. Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Resource Persons:	Mr. Charles Bunting Office of Education
	Dr. Harold Johnson NIE
Session V (Senate Room):	
Leader:	Mr. Marion Barry President D.C. School Board
Reporter:	Ms. Bonita Burgess Education Analyst Southern Regional Office National Urban League
Resource Persons:	Dr. Robert Worthington Office of Education
	Dr. Lee Burchinal NIE

Session VI (Wardman Room):

Leader:	Mr. Alvin Thomas Director of Civil Rights American Federation of Teachers
Reporter:	Ms. Mercedes Wright Acting Director of Education NAACP
Resource Persons:	Mr. Duane Matthies Office of Education
	Dr. Corinne Rieder NIE

Session VII (Woodley Room):

Leader:	Dr. Alfredo de los Santos President El Paso Community College
Reporter:	Mr. John Browne Doctoral Candidate University of Massachusetts
Resource Persons:	Mr. Duane Nielsen Office of Education
	Mr. Thomas Israel NIE

Session VIII (Baltimore Room):

Leader:	Dr. Roosevelt Johnson Professor of Special Services Ohio State University
Reporter:	Mr. Barry Matsumoto Wash. Representative Japanese American Citizens League
Resource Persons:	Dr. Howard Hjelm Office of Education
	Dr. Lois-ellin Datta NIE

Session IX (Potomac Room):

Leader:	Dr. Arnold Borrego U.S. Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People
Reporter:	Dr. Feliciano Rivera Mexican American Graduate Studies California State University

Resource Persons: Dr. William Pierce
Office of Education

Mr. Leonard Salazar
HEW

Dr.Lance Hodes
NIE

Session X (G-100 Room):

Leader: Hon. William Green
53rd Assemblyman
Los Angeles, California

Reporter: Dr. Percy Williams
Asst. State Superintendent
State of Maryland

Resource Persons: Dr. Elizabeth Simpson
Office of Education

Dr. Thomas Moorefield
NIE

3:30 p.m. **COFFEE BREAK**

4:00 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION** (Virginia Suite)

Report of Reaction Groups

6:00 p.m. **RECEPTION** (Maryland Suite)

7:00 p.m. **DINNER** (Maryland Suite)

Introduction of Speakers: Dr. Solomon Flores

Guest Speakers: Ms. Elizabeth Duncan Koontz
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Women's Bureau
Department of Labor

Mr. Arthur Fletcher
Executive Director
United Negro College Fund

Ms. Anna Chennault
Co-Chairwoman
National Republican Heritage Groups (Nationalities Council)

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1973

9:00 a.m. **RECOMMENDATION SESSIONS**

Session I (Adams Room): *Legislation*

Chairman:	Mr. John Warren Legislative Assistant House Education and Labor Committee U.S. House of Representatives
Reporter:	Ms. Yvonne Price Executive Assistant Leadership Conference on Civil Rights

Session II (Hamilton Room) *Employment*

Chairman:	Mr. Arthur Chapin Director Office of Equal Employment Opportunity Department of Labor
Reporter:	Mr. Ricardo Zazueta National Director Operation SER

Session III (Vinson Room): *Funding*

Chairman:	Dr. Charles Smith Associate Director Humanities and Social Science Rockefeller Foundation
Reporter:	Mr. Carl Anderson Vice President for Fund Raising National Urban Coalition

Session IV (Taft Room): *Labor*

Chairman:	Mr. Walter Davis Director of Education AFL-CIO
Reporter:	Mr. Narciso Cano Assistant Director Operation SER

Session V (Marshall Room) *Communications*

Chairman:	Ms. Malvyn Johnson Cox Broadcasting Company Washington, D.C.
Reporter:	Ms. Sheila Thomas WMAL—TV Washington, D.C.

Session VI (Warren Room): *Government*

Chairman:	Mr. Walter S. Wetzel Manpower Administration Regional Office Denver, Colorado
Reporter:	Hon. Robert Garcia State Legislature Bronx, New York

Session VII (Wardman Room) *Management*

Chairman:	Dr. Cleo Blackburn Board of Directors National Chamber of Commerce
Reporter:	Mr. Edward M. Hodges, III Assistant Vice-President Michigan Bell Telephone Company

Session VIII (Woodley Room): *Elementary Education*

Chairman:	Dr. William L. Fowler Principal George Washington School Daly City, California
Reporter:	Ms. Arlene Okamoto Teacher Berkeley Unified School District

Session IX (Madison Room): *Secondary Education*

Chairman:	Mr. Jose Angel Gutierrez Superintendent of Schools Crystal City, Texas
Reporter:	Ms. Thelma C. Lennon Director Pupil Personel Services N.C. State Department of Education

Session X: (Calvert Room) *Post Secondary Education:*

Chairman:	Dr. Charles Hurst President Malcolm X Community College Chicago, Illinois
Reporter:	Mr. Jose (Pepe) Barron Director Office of Spanish Speaking Programs American Association of Community/Junior Colleges

Session XI (Franklin Room) *Students:*

Chairman: Dr. Arthur Thomas
Director
Center for Student Rights & Responsibilities
Dayton, Ohio

Reporter: Ms. Margie Nogueras
Crusade for Restoration of Youth, Inc.
Bronx, New York

Session XII (G-100 Room) *Parents:*

Chairman: Dr. Evelina Antonetti
Executive Director
United Bronx Parents
Bronx, New York

Reporter: Ms. Agnes I. Chan
Advisory Committee for the Education of Bilingual Children
San Francisco, California

10:00 a.m. **COFFEE BREAK**

RESOLUTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

10:30 a.m. **GENERAL SESSION** (Continental Room)

Presiding: Mr. Reginald Petty

Presentations of Resolutions:

Session I

Session II

Session III

Session IV

Session V

Session VI

Session VII

Session VIII Elementary

Secondary

Post-Secondary

Session IX

Session X

12:00 Noon **CONFERENCE ADJOURNS**

Resolution and Recommendation Committee Meeting

Leader:

Ms. Arleen Winfield
Social Science Analyst
Women's Bureau
Department of Labor

Members:

Dr. Candido de Leon
President
Hostos Community College
Bronx, N.Y.

Ms. Patsy Fleming
Legislative Assistant
Rep. Augustus Hawkins
(D.Calif.)

Mr. Ulysses Byas
President
National Alliance of Black
Superintendent of Schools
Tuskegee, Alabama

Ms. Doreen Feng
OEO
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Ronald Patterson
Coordinator
Neighborhood Services
Community Action Organization
North Collins, N.Y.

Mr. Barry Matsumoto
Wash. Representative
Japanese American Citizens
League

Dr. Robert (Kelly) Acosta
California State Reading
Program
State Department of Education

APPENDIX B

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CAREER EDUCATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR MINORITIES

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Mr. Robert (Kelly) Acosta
3525 College Avenue
Sacramento, Calif. 95818

Dr. Ambrose D. Adams
PO Box 2548
Prairie View A & M College
Prairie View, Texas 77445

Ms. Esperanza C. Alzona
Mid-Atlantic AMIDS
Washington Technical Institute
4100 Conn. Ave. NW
Washington DC 20008

Mr. Robert H. Arents
New Jersey State Educ. Dept.
225 W. State St.
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Mr. Henry Arredondo
Arizona Dept. of Education
1535 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Ms. Mary R. Arevalo
Calif. State Dept. of Educ.
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, Calif.

Sister Callista Armand, SSF
Director
Institute for Teachers of
Minority Youth
734 15th St. NW, Suite 906
Washington DC

Sister Adele Arroyo
Worden School of Social Service
411 SW 24th St.
San Antonio, Texas

Mr. John Banks
Calif. Dept. of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, Calif.

Ms. Stephaine Barber
City Wide Youth Council
402 Broadway St.
Buffalo, New York 14204

Ms. Elaine Bailey
HEW
5600 Fisher Lane
Rockville, Md.

Mr. Robert L. Bailey
Career Education Project
10 Dorrance St.
Providence, Rhode Island 02906

Mr. James Barge
State Dept. of Education
Knott Building, Room 254
3013 Lycudon Dr.
Talahassee, Florida

Ms. Anna R. Barrett
NIE
Code 600, Room 612
Washington DC 20202

Ms. Bertha S. Baylor
AMIDS
4100 Conn. Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20008

Mr. Avis C. Bell
Nat'l. League of Cities
1612 K St. NW
Washington DC 20006

Ms. Toyo Biddle
Office of Asian American Affairs
330 Independence Ave. SW, Rm 3513
Washington DC

Mr. Kent Bennion
Office of Education
50 Fulton
San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. Joseph Black
Vice President
The Greyhound Corp.
Greyhound Tower
Phoenix, Arizona 85077

Dr. Cleo Blackburn
Board for Fundamental Education
156 E. Market St.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Ms. Patricia Blackwell
John Dingle Assoc.
Suite 7300
L'Enfant Plaza North
Washington DC

Mr. William L. Blakley
9th Floor, 1100 Commerce St.
OEO
Dallas, Texas 75202

Ms. Julia Chang Bloch
c/o Sen. Charles Percy
Room 311, Senate Annex
Washington DC 20510

Ms. Dorothy Bolden
President
Domestic Workers Union
52 Fairlie St. NW
Atlanta, Ga. 30303

Ms. Lois Bowman
University of Michigan
1321 East Court
Flint, Michigan

Mr. Joseph E. Bradley
Office of African-American
  Affairs
Office of Education
Washington DC 20202

Ms. Velma S. Brawner
Office of Education
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Mr. William F. Brazziel
Univ. of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

Ms. Christine Brooks
Vice President
Winslow Street Block Club
22 Larchmont Rd.
Buffalo, N.Y. 14214

Margo and Gene T. Brooks, Jr.
Appalachian Educational Lab
301½ Bluefield Ave.
Charleston, West Virginia

Mr. Morris L. Brown
Office of Education
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Mr. John Browne
University of Massachusetts
3-K Brandywine Drive
Amherst, Mass. 01002

Mr. Charles Bunting
Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Ms. Juliet Brudney
Career Education
Education Development Center
55 Chapel St.
Newton, Massachusetts

Mr. Rudolph E. Bryant
Program for Policy Studies
GWU Fellowship Program
2100 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC

Ms. Pearleen Butler
Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Mr. Ulysses Byas
Nat'l. Alliance of Black School
  Superintendents
PO Box 90
Tuskegee, Alabama 36083

Mr. Robert Calvert Jr.
Office of Education
Chief Adult and Voc'l. Educ.
  Survey Branch
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Mr. Tony H. Calvo
450 North Grand Ave.
Box 3307 Room P-201
Los Angeles, Calif. 90012

Mr. Narciso Cano
Jobs for Progress, Inc.
9841 Airport Blvd.
Room 1020
Los Angeles, California 90045

Dr. W. Thomas Carter
Office of Education
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Mr. Manuel Carrillo
Office for Spanish Surnamed
  Americans
330 Independence Ave. SW
Room 4544
Washington, D.C. 20201

Mr. George Castro
Rhode Island State Voc'l. Educ.
  Advisory Council
52 Carolina Ave.
Providence, Rhode Island

Ms. Agnes I. Chan
Advisory Committee for the
Education of Bilingual Children
980 Sacramento St., Apt. 1001
San Francisco, Calif. 94108

Rev. Paul Chan
Sino-American Amity Fund, Inc.
89 Riverside Dr.
New York N.Y. 10024

Mr. Gilbert J. Chavez
Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Ms. Loly Lee Chen
L.A. County Dept. of Public
Social Services
2323 Corinth Ave.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90064

Dr. William Y. Chen
5505 Waterway Terrace
Rockville, Md.

Ms. Anna Chennault
2510 Virginia Ave. NW
Watergate East
Washington DC 20037

Mr. Irving Sheu Kee Chin
Chinese-American Citizens League
Commissioner of Human Rights, NYC
30 Broad St.
New York, N.Y. 10004

Dr. William Chin-Lee
President, Chinese Consolidated
Benevolent Ass'n.
740 Sixth St. NW
Washington DC

Mr. George Y. Chinn
President
San Francisco Board of Education
950 Stockton St.
San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. Donald L. Clark
Rutgers University
Livingston College
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Ms. Josie M. Cole
Dept. of Career Development
DC Public Schools
Suite 1001, 415 12th St. NW
Washington DC 20004

Ms. Katherine W. Cole
American Personnel and Guidance
Association
3652 Warder St. NW
Washington DC 20010

Mr. Herman Coleman
Associate Executive Secretary
Michigan Education Association
PO Box 673
East Lansing, Mich. 48823

Mr. Paul L. Collins
Executive Assistant
American Personnel and Guidance
Association
1607 New Hampshire Ave. NW
Washington DC 20009

Mr. Jerry S. Cooper
Bureau of the Census
1241 Kenyon St. NW
Washington DC 20010

Ms. Ruth Corcoran
1930 Lake Road
Ontario, New York 14519

Ms. Pamela A. Coughlin
Federation of Rocky Mt. States
2480 W. 26th Ave.
Denver, Colorado 80211

Mr. Lawrence Covington
Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Ms. Victoria Cowles
Continuum
1301 33rd St. NW
Washington DC

Ms. Marion Craft
Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Dr. Halbert Crowder
Director of Development
Daniel Payne College
6415 Washington Blvd.
Birmingham, Alabama 35212

Mr. W. G. Cummens
Office of Education
1114 Commerce St.
Dallas, Texas

Mr. Michael Daniels
California State College
6101 E. 7th St.
Long Beach, Calif. 90801

Dr. L.F. Davenport
Tuskegee Institute
201 Franklin Road
Tuskegee, Alabama 36088

Mr. Ralph U. Davis
Vocational and Adult Education
The Navajo Tribe
Window Rock, Arizona 86515

Mr. Walter Davis
Director of Education
AFL-CIO
815 16th St. NW
Washington DC

Ms. Delores S. Dean
DHEW Adult Education
3900 16th St. NW, #517
Washington DC

Carnell Deason
Omaha Public Schools
5216 North 85th St.
Omaha, Nebraska 68131

Dr. Clyde E. DeBerry
University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh
800 Algoma Blvd.
Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54901

Dr. Candido de Leon
President
Hostos Community College
475 Grande Concourse
Bronx, N.Y. 10451

Mr. Calvin Dellefield
Executive Director
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
425 13th St. NW
Washington DC 20004

Mr. Gilberto de los Santos
El Paso Community College
6601 Dyer St.
El Paso, Texas 79904

Ms. Dorothy Dickerson
NCEBO
1211 Conn. Ave. NW, Suite 310
Washington DC 20036

Prof. Howard F. Didsbury, Jr.
Executive Director
Program for the Study of the
Future
Newark State College
2862 28th St. NW
Washington DC 20008

Ms. Amy Dillard
Women's Bureau
3645 6th St. SF#7
Washington DC

Mr. Joseph Dixon
Congress of Racial Equality
200 W 135th St.
New York, N.Y.

Mr. John W. Dobbs
Assistant Superintendent
Michigan Dept. of Education
520 Michigan National Tower
Lansing, Michigan 48902

W.H. Douglass
Phillip Morris, Inc.
100 Park Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10017

Dr. Ernest A. Dow
Executive Director
National Association of Black
Adult Educators
1411 K St. NW
Washington DC 20005

Ms. Carole J. Dudley
DC Schools—Career Development
4301 13th St. NW
Washington DC

Mr. Steven Ebbin
George Washington University
2100 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC 20006

Mr. Luther Elliott
A Better Chance
1028 Conn. Ave. NW, #616
Washington DC 20036

Mr. Todd Endo
5363 Essex Court
Alexandria, Virginia 22311

Mr. Morris F. Epps
Fairfax County Public Schools
10700 Page Ave.
Fairfax, Va. 22030

Mr. Antonio Esquibel
Teacher Corps
Southern Colorado State College
2200 M. Bonfonte Blvd.
Pueblo, Colorado 81001

Mr. Samuel B. Ethridge
Assistant Executive Secretary
  for Teacher Rights and
  Responsibility
1201 16th St. NW
Washington DC 20036

Ms. Martha Everson
ICE
226 Dixwell Ave.
New Haven, Conn.

Mr. Edward I. Farley, Jr.
HEW—Offfice of the Secretary
330 Independence Ave.
Washington DC 20201

Ms. Ruthe J. Farmer
National Urban Coalition
4304 18th St. NW
Washington DC

Ms. Doreen Yen Hung Feng
OEO
1200 19th St. NW
Washington DC

Mr. Clifford D. Fields
DC Public Schools
415 12th St. NW
Washington DC 20004

Ms. Ann B. Finkelstein
George Washington University
2100 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington DC

Ms. Alice Fins
American Personnel and Guidance Assn.
1607 New Hampshire Ave. NW
Washington DC

Mr. Miles Mark Fisher, IV
Nat'l. Assn. for Equal Opportunity
  in Higher Education
2001 S St. NW, Suite 450
Washington DC 20009

Mr. Anthony Fitchue
National Urban League
477 Madison Ave., 5th Floor
New York, N.Y. 10023

Ms. Charlotte L. Fleming
Eastern High School
17th and E. Capitol Sts. NW
Washington DC

Ms. Patricia Fleming
Legislative Assistant
Rep. Augustus Hawkins
U.S House of Representatives
Washington DC 20515

Mr. Arthur Fletcher
Executive Director
United Negro College Fund
55 E. 52nd St.
New York, NY

Dr. T.R. (Dick) Flores
Career Education Model IV
Box 3078
Glasgow AFB, Montana 5[illegible]231

Dr. Solomon Flores
Chicago State University
9500 King Dr.
Chicago, Illinois 60615

Ms. Mary Flowers
Women's Bureau
Dept. of Labor, Room 1326-ML
Washington DC 20210

Mr. Robert A. Forbes
S. Jr. High School, ICE Office
701 S. Nevada Ave.
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Ms. Rachel Froiland
ARIES Corporation
4930 W. 77th
Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. Frank Fujii
Applied and Visual Communication
Seattle Central Community College
1718 Broadway
Seattle, Washington 98122

Mr. Ben Gargrave
Calif. Advisory Council on Voc'l.
  Education
745 Franklin St.
San Francisco, California

Mr. James H. Gary
Special Rep.
International Union of Operating
  Engineers
1125 17th St. NW
Washington DC 20036

Mr. Leon Harris
Retail, Wholesale and Dept.
Store Union
AFL-CIO
101 West 31st St. #2000
New York, N.Y. 10001

Dr. Barbara Hatten
Stanford Urban-Rural School
Development
536 Alvarado Rd.
Stanford University
Stanford, Calif. 94305

Mr. Robbie L. Hayes
Mid-Atlantic AMIDS
4100 Connecticut Ave. NW
Washington DC 20008

Dr. A.A. Hedgeman
Board of Education
1377 Jerome Blvd.
New York, N.Y.

Ms. Joan Heger
Mountain Plains Program
Glasgow AFB, Montana 59231

Dr. Robert Heger
Mt. Plains Ed. and Economic
Development Corp.
Glasgow AFB, Montana 59231

Ms. Alexis Herman
Director
Black Women Employment Program
Southern Regional Council, Inc.
52 Fairlie St. NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Mr. Elam K. Hertzler
Office of Education NCET
Reporters' Building
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Dr. Howard Hjelm
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Mr. Richard Hobson
OE, Division of Manpower
Development and Training
7th and D Sts. SW, Rm 5658
Washington DC 20201

Mr. Lance Hodes
NIE
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Mr. Edward M. Hodges, III
Assistant Vice President
Michigan Bell Telephone Co.
1365 Cass Ave.
Detroit, Mich. 48226

Ms. Caroline Hughes
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
1000 S. Howerton
Cushing, Oklahoma 74023

Ms. Katherine J. Hunter
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
425 13th St. N.W.
Washington DC

Mr. Earl G. Ingram
Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave. SW, Rm. 2049
Washington DC 20202

Ms. Ada Elsa Izcoa
District 9
New York, New York

Mr. Dean C. Jackson
Navajo Community College
Manyfarms, Arizona

Mr. Richard A. Jackson
Michigan Dept. of Education
Adult and Continuing Education
PO Box 420
Lansing, Michigan 48902

Dr. Russell A. Jackson, Jr.
Superintendent
Roosevelt School District No. 66
6000 South 7th St.
Phoenix, Arizona 85040

Mr. Santiago Jackson
Los Angeles Unified School District
450 N. Grand H245
Los Angeles, Calif.

Gov. Overton James
Director of Indian Education
Room 210-B
State Capitol Bldg.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Ms. Carole A. Jamison
Director, Program Division
American Home Economics Assoc.
2010 Mass. Ave. NW
Washington DC 20036

Ms. Ruth Geldon
New Rochelle Bd. of Education
515 North Ave.
New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801

Mr. Howard Gholson
Office of Education
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Mr. Anthony C. Gibbs, Jr.
Washington Intern
120 G St. SW
Washington DC

Mr. Felton A. Gibson
U.S. ACTION (Peace Corps & Vista)
1735 I St. NW
Washington DC

Ms. Carol Gibson
National Urban League
477 Madison Ave.
New York, NY 10023

Mr. Louis (Ruiz) Gonzalos
Cabinet Committee on Opportunities
for the Spanish Speaking People
1707 H St. NW
Washington DC 20506

Mr. Andrew Goodrich
3918 Fulton St. NW, #502
Washington DC

Ms. Edith Sherry Gordon
Coppin State College
2500 W. North Ave.
Baltimore, Maryland 21216

Ms. Nancy Graham
National Urban Coalition
2100 M St. NW
Washington DC 20037

Mr. William F. Gray
Dixwell Neighborhood Corp.
226 Dixwell Ave.
New Haven, Conn.

Mr. Clarence D. Green
2978 W. Grand Blvd.
N.C. AMIDS
Detroit, Michigan

Ms. Julianne Griffey
HEW OSC OIA
330 Independence Ave. SW
Washington DC 20201

Mr. Ronald Gross
Mayor's Educational Task Force
972 Broad St.
Newark,N.J. 07102

Ms. Dolores Guerrero
Washington Interns in Education
2000 L St. NW
Washington DC

Mr. Tito Guerrero, III
Washington Interns in Education
2000 L St. NW
Washington DC

Dr. Ewart Guinier
Chairman
Afro-American Studies Dept.
Harvard University
77 Dunster St.
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Ms. Jean E. Hall
163—45 130th Ave.
Jamaica, New York 11434

Mr. David Hampson
NIE
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Mr. Ross Harano
Japanese American Citizens League
21 West Elm
Chicago, Illinois 60610

Mr. Charles L. Jenkins
Office of African American Affairs
Office of Education, Rm. 1159
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Dr. Martin D. Jenkins
Director of Urban Affairs
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 810
Washington DC 20036

Ms. Jeanie Jew
740 Sixth St. NW
Washington DC

Mr. Chris R. Johnson
Mt. Plains
PO Box 24
Sisseton, South Dakota

Dr. Harold Johnson
NIE
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Dr. Roosevelt Johnson
Educational-Community Counselors
Assoc.
2425 N. High St.
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Mr. Samuel Johnson
National Scholarship & Funds for
Negro Students
965 Hunter St. NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

R. Raymond Jones
Kentucky State Board of Supervisors
Division of Equal Educational
Opportunities
Frankfort, Ky.

Mr. Charles Jordan
Northwest Regional Lab
710 SW 2nd
Portland, Oregon

Dr. Howard Jordan, Jr.
244 Washington St. SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30311

Mr. Carl Jorgensen
Supervisor
Business Education
State Dept. of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

Mr. George Kahdy
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. William Keating
Washington Technical Institute
4100 Connecticut Ave. NW
Washington DC

Ms. Barbara H. Kemp
Office of Education
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Mr. Sam Kerr
Office of Education
1321 2nd Ave.
Seattle, Washington

Ms. Marceline S. Kevis
Coeur d'Alene Tribal Council
Route 1, Box 2
Worley, Idaho 83876

Ms. Madie A. Kincy
Georgia Dept. of Education
Division of Curriculum Development
156 Trinity Ave. SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Mr. Edward B. King, Jr.
Assoc. of American Publishers, Inc.
1 Park Ave., Suite 1810
New York, N.Y. 10016

Mr. George Klinkhamer
Office of Education, BEH
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Ms. Elizabeth Duncan Koontz
Deputy Asst. Secretary of Labor
Women's Bureau, Room 1303
14th and Constitution Ave. NW
Washington DC 20210

Junji Kumamoto
Japanese American Citizens League
675 Spruce St.
Riverside, California 92507

Ms. Cleopatra Lawton
Justice Department
101 Indiana Ave. NW
Washington DC

Mr. Delano E. Lewis
General Public Affairs Mgr.
C & P Telephone Co.
1325 G St. NW
Washington DC

Mr. Ernest E. Lewis
Appalachia Ed. Lab
EBCE Mod. II
Charleston, West Virginia

Mr. William L. Lewis
Office of Education
300 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois

Ms. Barbara Locke
A School Within a School
106 S. Harrison St.
E. Orange, N.J. 07018

Mr. Rutherford E. Lockette
Professor of Vocational Education
2604 CL
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Penna. 15213

Mr. James H. Lockhart
OE/Bureau of Elementary and
Secondary Education
400 Maryland Ave SW
Washington DC 20202

Ms. Elaine Long
Office of Education
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Ms. Andrea J. Love
American Assoc. of Community and
Junior Colleges
7521 Blair Rd., Apt. 104
Takoma Park, Maryland 20012

Mr. Juan R. Lujan
Southwest Educational
Development Lab.
800 Brazos St.
Austin, Texas 78701

Dr. Duane R. Lund
National Advisory Council for
Vocational Education
Staples, Minnesota

Mr. Richard A. Macer
Special Needs Programs
611 State Office Bldg.
65 South Front St.
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dr. Paul Manchak
Office of Education
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Mr. H.S. Mandell
BOAE Office of Education
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Dr. Florence F. Mann
Educational & Community Renewal
District 9, Bank St. College
New York, N.Y.

Mr. Eugene V. Martin
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
Suite 852, 425 13th St. NW
Washington DC 20004

Mr. Feliciano Martoral
Inner City Employment and
Resource Developemnt
226 Dixwell Ave.
New Haven, Conn.

Mr. Barry Matsumato
Washington Representative
Japanese American Citizens League
1730 Rhode Island Ave. NW
Washington DC

Mr. Duane Mattheis
Office of Education
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Jewell Mazique
4443 13th St. NE
Washington DC 20017

Mr. Thaine McCormick
Office of Education
601 E. 12th St.
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Mr. Lloyd M. McCullough
UCLA
123 Moore Hall
Los Angeles, Calif. 90024

Mr. Sherrill D. McMillen
Office of Education
7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Ms. Mary Meador
Doubleday Publishers
6509 Ridgeway Dr.
Springfield, Virginia 22150

Dr. Xavier Mena
Deputy Director
Job Corps
1111 18th St. NW
Washington DC

Mr. Bernard Michael
HEW FICE
410 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC

Ms. Dharathula H. Millender
2409 W. 5th Ave.
Gary, Indiana

Mr. Aaron J. Miller
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Ms. Rose Marie Miller
Far West Lab
360 22nd St.
Oak., Calif. 94609

Mr. Leonard Mitchell
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

Mr. Astor Mizuhara
1720 Oregon St.
Berkeley, Calif. 94703

Mr. Lewis P. Moore
Widening Horizon Program
148 N. New Road
Pleasantville, New Jersey

Ms. Marilyn B. Moore
DC Public Schools
Career Development
4301 13th St. NW
Washington DC

Mr. Frank Moreno
LULAC Educational Com.
4805 Karchmer
Corpus Christi, Texas

Dr. Neal V. Musmanno
Executive Assistant for Public
Affairs
Room 512, Education Building
Harrisburg, Penna. 17126

Ms. Ruth G. Nadel
Women's Bureau
Department of Labor
Washington DC 20210

Mr. Robert A. Nakamura
3222 W. Jefferson Blvd. #3
Los Angeles, Calif. 90016

Ms. Mary W.E. Natani
Women's Bureau
Department of Labor
10312 Folk St.
Silver Spring, Md. 20902

Dr. Duane M. Nielsen
Office of Education
Room 4072, 400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Ms. Margarita Nogueras
Crusade for Moral Restoration
of Youth, Inc.
761 E. 150th St.
Bronx, New York 10455

Dr. Joseph M. O'Connell
181 Woodside Ave.
Buffalo, New York 14220

Mr. Charles O'Connor
Office of Education
26 Federal Plaza
New York , N.Y.

Ms. Arlene Okamoto
1001 Third St. SW
Washington DC 20202

Mr. Walter Ong
Chinese Welfare Council
3440 North 16th St.
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Ms. Zelda Oppenheimer
Chicago Board of Education
5439 S. Cornell
Chicago, Illinois

Mr. Fred J. Padilla
1151 San Gabriel Blvd.
Rosemead, California 91770

Mr. Dennis K. Palmer
Dept. of Measurement and Guidance
Houghton Mifflin Co.
110 Tremont St.
Boston, Mass. 02107

Ms. Anita Vejil Pando
Weber Council of Spanish Speaking
Organizations
350 Healy St.
Ogden, Utah 84401

Ms. Carolyn R. Parker
D.C. Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
2215 5th St. NE, Suite 200
Washington DC 20002

Ms. Gail A. Parks
NIE
7th and D Sts. SW, Code 600
Washington DC 20201

Mr. Rogert M. Parrish
Director
Urban Education Center
105 Dodge St.
Providence, Rhode Island 02907

Mr. Ronald Patterson
Community Action Organization
10518 Main St.
North Collins, New York 14111

Mr. Stan Patterson
HEW Office for Com. Col. Ed.
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Michon E. Peck
Public Schools
District of Columbia
5th and K Sts. NE
Hayes Adm. Annex
Washington DC

Mr. Alex Perez
9841 Airport Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90045

Mr. Rafael Perez
ESTUDIA, Inc.
Community Education Program
136 Olympic Avenue
Buffalo, New York 14215

Mr. Bruce Peterson
Assistant Executive Secretary
State Board of Educational
Finance
#201 Legislative Executive Bldg.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Mr. Reginald Petty
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
Chairman, Conference Steering Comm.
423 13th St. NW
Washington DC

Mr. Jasper Peyton
Assistant Education Director
International Ladies Garment
Workers Union
1710 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10019

Mr. Roger R. Philbrick
Dept. of Public Instruction
126 Langdon St.
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Ms. Annie K. Phillips
Community Group Health Foundation
3308 14th St. NW
Washington DC

Mr. J. Steven Picou
Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Rd.
Columbus, Ohio

Mr. Lyman F. Pierce
Office of Education
3119 A, 7th and D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Dr. William F. Pierce
Deputy Commissioner
Bureau of Occupational and
Adult Education, Office of Educ.
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Mr. Robert Porras
School District No. 9
1377 Jerome Ave.
Bronx, New York 10452

Mr. Grady E. Poulard
The Independent Foundation
1028 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 509
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Ronald Prescott
Multicultural Education Bldg P-219
450 North Grand Ave.
Los Angeles, Claif. 90051

Ms. Yvonne Price
Executive Assistant
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
NAACP
2027 Mass. Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Moses L. Potter
Inner City Employment & Resource
Development
226 Dixwell Ave.
New Haven, Conn.

Ms. Marlene Provizer
1763 R Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

Mr. George R. Quarles
Director
Office of Career Education
110 Livingston St.
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Mr. Ed Ramos
OSSA DHEW
HEW North
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Antonio Raseon
Room 3522 North
330 Independence Ave., SW
Washington DC 20201

Mr. Howard P. Rawlings
Black Coalition of the University of
Maryland
Room 204, 4200 Edmundson Ave.
Baltimore, Md. 21229

Mr. William F. Roark
Brick Institute of America
1750 Old Meadow Road
McLean, Va. 22101

Mr. George M. Roberts
Tenn. Higher Education Commission
908 Andrew Jackson State Office B
Nashville, Tenn.

Ms. Liz Robinson
United Planning Organization
1021 14th Street, NW
Washington DC

Mr. Gilbert Rochon
Director
Inner City Employment & Resource
Development
226 Dixwell Ave.
New Haven Conn.

Ms. Therese Rooney
Loretto Adult Education Center
1447 E 65th Street
New York, New York

Dr. James Rosser
Assistant Chancellor
Office of Academic Affairs
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Mr. Melvin M. Rottenberg
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington DC

Mr. Urwin Rowntree
Regional Office of Education
Kennedy Bldg.
Boston, Mass.

Mr. Preston M. Royster
Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Ms. Leticia Saenz
Southwest Program Development Corp.
South Texas Health Consortium
P.O. Box 5000
San Antonio, Texas 78201

Mr. Leonard Salazar
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20202

Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.
Vice President
Board of Education
135 Van Ness Ave.
San Francisco, Calif. 94103

Ms. Corinne Sanchez
Montal Educational Associates
323 Harps Street, #1
San Fernando, Calif. 91340

Mr. Blan Sandlin
Guidance Counseling Services
State Dept. of Education
State Capitol
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Ms. Joan L. Santelli
Xerox Learning Systems
1911 N. Ft. Myer Drive
Arlington, Va.

Ms. Miriam E. Satterfield
Dept. of Community Affairs
Div. of Human Resources Dev.
289 Promenade St.
Providence, Rhode Island

Mr. Kenneth L. Saupitty
Oklahomans for Indian Opportunity
555 Constitution
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Mr. George H. Sealey, Jr.
Office of Education
ROB-3, 7th & D Sts. SW
Washington DC 20201

Mr. Arthur Sears, Jr.
General Electric
570 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10022

Mr. Arthur T. Shack
State Advisory Council for
Vocational Education
610 W. Ottawa #1407
Lansing, Michigan 48902

Ms. Chrystine R. Shack
PO Box 928
Lansing, Michigan 48904

Mr. Augustus Shaw
1447 E. Coronado Drive
Phoenix, Arizona 85006

Mr. Samuel Shepard, Jr.
1101 E 10th St.
East Chicago Heights, Ill. 60411

Mr. Francis Shieh
Chairman
Dept. of Economics
Prince Georges Community College
Largo, Maryland 20870

Dr. Melvin Sikes
Prof. of Educational Psychology
University of Texas
311 Sutton Hall
Austin, Texas 78712

Dr. Robert Singleton
Education Finance Reform Project
3860 Santa Barbara Ave.
Suite 102
Los Angeles, Calif. 90043

Mr. Emmitt J. Slingsby
Office of Supt. of Public Instruction
325 S. Fifth St.
Springfield, Ill. 62706

Mr. Walter L. Smart
National Federation of Settlements and
Neighborhood Centers
232 Madison Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10016

Ms. Carol J. Smith
Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave. S.W. Room 4033
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Eddie G. Smith, Jr.
Community Group Health Foundation
740 6th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Mr. Melvin M. Spencer
USOE BAUTE
7th & D Sts. S.W.
Washington DC 20201

Dr. E. Median Spryropoulos
Cabinet Committee on Opportunities
for Spanish Speaking People
1707 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Nevzer Stacey
Career Education Task Force, NIE
Code 600, Room 612
Washington DC 20202

Mr. Olando Stevens
Cultural Awareness Center
Mesa Vista Hall, Room 2078
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, N.M. 87106

Mr. Carlos G. Stewart
Office of Education
7th & D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Mr. Jesse N. Stone, Jr.
La. State Dept. of Education
P.O. Box 44064
Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Mr. Robert H. Suggs
Dept. of Counselor Education
SUC
Brockport, New York

Mr. LeRoy H. Swenson
Office of Education
1961 Stout St.
Denver, Colorado 80202

Ms. Joan Tang
4710 Bethesda Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland

Mr. Izumi Tanaguchi
Japanese American Citizens League
738 East Tenaya Way
Fresno, California 93710

Ms. Tami Taylor
Independent Foundation
1028 Connecticut Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Mr. Hunter M. Temple
Education Turnkey Systems
770 Menlo Avenue
Menlo Park, Calif.

Mr. Alvin Thomas
Director of Civil Rights
American Federation of Teachers
1012—14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Elton R. Thomas
Advisory Council for Technical-
Vocational Education in Texas
2030 Encino Circle
Austin, Texas 78723

Mr. Newton S. Thomas
Div. of EEO
State Dept. of Education
Capitol Plaza Towers 1629
Louisville, Kentucky

Ms. Sheila G. Thomas
WMAL TV
4461 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

Dr John B. Tsu
Institute of Far Eastern Studies
Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey 07079

Ms. Pauline W. Tsai
Organization of Chinese Americans
3214 Quesada St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20015

Mr. T. L. Tsai
Executive Director
National Chinese Welfare Council
3214 Quesada St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20015

Mr. Soleng Tom
15 West 33rd Street
Tucson, Arizona

Mr. Jesse H. Turner
Research for Better Schools
1700 Market St.
Philadelphia, Penn.

Mr. Matthew Turner
New York University
347 W. 122
204 Barney Bldg.
Washington Square
New York, New York

Mr. Robert Ullery
New York State Dept. of Education
Industry Education Coordinator
99 Washington Ave.
Albany, New York 11120

Mr. David Ushio
Executive Director
Japanese-American Citizens League
1634 Post Street
San Francisco, Calif. 94115

Ms. Grayce K. Uyehara
Japanese American Citizens League
1535 Marlboro Road
Westchester, Pa. 19380

Delfino Valdez
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
T-VI 525 Buena Vista SE
Albuquerque, N.M. 87106

Ms. Louise Vetter
Center for Vocational Technical
Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Mr. Bertran F. Wallace
Board of Education
145 Palmer Road
Yonkers, New York 10701

Mr. George E. Wallace
Director
AVTE Office of Education
50—7th St. NE
Room 550
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Ms. K. Wallace
Women's Bureau
Dept. of Labor
Washington, D.C.

Mr. LeRoy Walser
Office of Education
Room 5678 ROB #3
7th & D Streets NW
Washington, DC 20201

Mr. Kung-Lee Wang
Organization of Chinese Americans
1940 Dundee Road
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Ms. Betty A. Ward
Assistant Director
African-American Affairs, OE
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington DC 20202

Mr. Robert E. Washington
Chairman, California Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
1500 Fifth St. Room 120
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. W. Norman Watts
Neighborhood Youth Corps
Dept. of Labor
497 Bonsall Ave.
Yeadon, Penna. 19050

Dr. Bettina Weary
Office of Education
Capitol Park Towers
301 G Street SW
Washington DC

Mr. Harold Webb
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Raleigh, N.C. 27602

Ms. Jean A. Wells
Women's Bureau
US Dept. of Labor
Washington, DC 20210

Ms. Jeanne Werschke
Colorado Dept. of Education
201 E. Colfax, Room 436
Denver, Colorado

Ms. Brenda W. White
Office of Education
7th & D Streets SW, ROB #3
Washington DC 20201

Ms. Josie White Eagle
State Dept. of Public Instruction
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Mr. Thomas J. Whaley
Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave. S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ms. Rose K. Wiener
Dept. of Labor
254 Vanguard Bldg.
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Bill Wiggenhorn
Xerox Learning System
1901 N.F. Myer Drive
Arlington, Va.

Mr. Isaac Wilder
Office of Education NCIES SE
7th & D Streets S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Mr. Ronald Wildy
Eastern High School
19th & E. Capitol Sts., SE
Washington DC

Ms. Jane A. Willenz
American Veterans Committee
1333 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC

Ms. Amand L. Williams
Berkeley Public Library
2412 Valley St.
Berkeley, Calif. 94702

Mr. Calvin Williams
Special Assist to the Governor
for Educational Affairs
Statehouse
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Mr. Eugene J. Williams
American Personnel and Guidance
Assoc.
1607 New Hampshire Ave., NW
Washington DC

Dr. Percy V. Williams
Assist State Superintendent
Maryland State Dept. of Education
P.O. Box 8717, Friendship Airport
Baltimore, Md.

Mr. Talcondge Williams
PAR, Inc.
321 Falloway
Baltimore, Md.

Ms. Arleen D. Winfield
Women's Bureau—Room 1322
U.S. Dept. of Labor
14th & Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Mitchell Wolf
Educational & Community Counselors
Assoc.
2425 N. High Street
Columbus, Ohio

Ms. Gwen Wong
HEW, Social Rehabilitation Serv.
Minority Studies
Room 5062
330 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Mr. Albert B. Wood
Maryland State Dept. of Education
Box 8717, Friendship Airport
Baltimore, Md. 21240

Dr. Robert Worthington
Office of Education
7th & D Streets, SW
Washington, DC 20201

Ms. Mercedes Wright
Acting Director of Education
NAACP
1790 Broadway
New York, New York 10019

Mr. William C. Young
Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
ROB 6, Room 4143
Washington, D.C. 20202